

VOLUME XIV

DECEMBER, 1928

NUMBER 8

BULLETIN
OF
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

APPOINTMENT SERVICE
INDEX

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE: JOSEPH ALLEN; G. R. COFFMAN;
MARGARET L. FARRAND; H. W. TYLER, *Chairman*

222 CHARLES RIVER ROAD
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

PUBLISHED BY
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
20TH AND NORTHAMPTON STS., EASTON, PA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Notes and Announcements

Appointment Service.....	568
Grants for Research.....	568
Southern Conference on Education.....	569
Handbook of University Exchanges in Europe.....	569
New Rhodes Scholarship Plan.....	569
British Debaters in America.....	570
<i>School and Society</i> and the <i>Educational Review</i>	570
<i>British Universities Review</i>	571

Committee A, Academic Freedom and Tenure

South Dakota State College.....	572
---------------------------------	-----

Reviews

Facing Life, <i>W. H. P. Faunce</i>	576
The Engineer, <i>R. L. Sackett</i>	576
Which College? <i>Rita S. Halle</i>	577
Small Colleges and Teacher Training, <i>Jacob G. Meyer</i>	578
Education for World-Citizenship, <i>W. G. Carr</i>	579

Educational Discussion

Logic and Persuasion, <i>E. H. Paget</i>	582
Teaching and the Ph.D., <i>M. E. Haggerty</i>	584
Women and the Ph.D., <i>Emilie J. Hutchinson</i>	587
What is Graduate Work? <i>D. A. Robertson</i>	592
Professional and Semi-Professional Schools or Divisions at the Graduate Level, <i>C. E. Seashore</i>	594
"Standards" and the Teaching Load in Science.....	597
Defects in College Teaching, <i>C. C. Crawford</i>	599
Training College Teachers, <i>C. C. Little</i>	603
College Chapel, A British Point of View, <i>Arthur Ripon</i>	606
College Chapel, An American Point of View, <i>W. L. Sperry</i>	608
In Praise of Bipeds.....	609

Local and Chapter Notes

Amherst, Scholastic Aptitude Tests.....	612
Barnard, Endowment of Women's Colleges.....	613
California, Grants in Aid of Research.....	614
Louisiana, Psychological Tests.....	616

TABLE OF CONTENTS

567

McPherson, Experiment in Itinerant Education.....	617
Oberlin, Statement of Aims.....	618
Park, Honors Work.....	619
Pembroke, Change of Name.....	620
Princeton, Varied Chapel Services.....	620
Radcliffe, Tutorial House.....	621
Wisconsin, Ph.D.'s in Industry.....	621
Wyoming, Chapter Program.....	622

Membership

Members Elected.....	623
Nominations for Membership.....	624

Index, Vol. XIV.....	631
----------------------	-----

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

APPOINTMENT SERVICE.—At the meeting of the Council held in New York City, November 17, it was *voted*, on recommendation of the special committee on Placement Service, to recommend to the Association at the Annual Meeting the following resolutions:

That as soon as the permanent office is established in Washington, the Secretary proceed with the gradual organization of an appointment service.

That there be established by proper constitutional amendment a class of non-voting junior members, composed of graduate students and teachers not yet eligible for full membership under the service requirement.

That the privileges of the appointment service be restricted to members of this Association.

That the service be planned to become self-supporting (on the basis of a fee of three per cent) but that, for the purpose of establishing it, the present surplus funds be drawn upon to an extent not exceeding \$2000 a year for five years.

That the Secretary arrange for the enrolment (without charge) of members and junior members and for the circulation of information in regard to vacancies.

The Council in recommending this plan expresses the opinion that it is an important function of this Association to facilitate the appointment of competent persons for teaching positions in colleges and universities. In view of the importance of the plan, the Council desires not only action at the Annual Meeting of the Association but so far as practicable the equivalent of a referendum vote by the general membership. It is accordingly requested that the chapters of the Association *vote* on the question of approval of the general plan, transmitting such votes through their delegates, or by letter, to the Annual Meeting. Any members whose opinions are not thus expressed are hereby invited to send them directly to the office of the Secretary not later than January 10, 1929.

GRANTS FOR RESEARCH.—The American Council of Learned Societies announces that it is able to offer in each of the three years 1929–31 a limited number of small grants to individual scholars to assist them in carrying on definite projects of research in the humanistic sciences (philosophy, philology and literature, linguistics, art and archaeology, and history).

The grants are designed to facilitate and encourage research by mature scholars who are engaged in constructive projects of research and who are in actual need of such aid and unable to obtain it from other sources. The grants are available for specific purposes, such as travel, personal and secretarial assistance, the preparation or purchase of equipment, material, etc.

The grants are restricted to scholars who are citizens of the United States or who are permanently domiciled or employed therein. They will not be awarded for the purpose of aiding in the fulfilment of the requirements for any academic degree, and, as a rule, preference in their award will be given to scholars who lack access to other funds maintained for similar purposes.

The maximum amount of these grants is \$300. Applications for grants to be awarded in 1929 must be made not later than January 31. Information respecting mode of applications, etc., will be furnished upon request to Waldo G. Leland, Permanent Secretary of the American Council of Learned Societies, 907 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C.

SOUTHERN CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION.—The first of what it is planned to make an annual series of Southern Conferences on Education, was held at Chapel Hill, N. C., on November 15, 16, and 17. Some hundred and fifty delegates attended, including college presidents, state superintendents of education, and two governors. Subjects of discussion included: The relation of higher education to the system of public instruction, the responsibilities and opportunities of the American college, libraries, adult education, physical education, and finance in public education.

HANDBOOK OF UNIVERSITY EXCHANGES IN EUROPE.—The League of Nations Institute of Intellectual Cooperation has issued a handbook of University Exchanges in Europe "giving an impartial and, as far as may be, complete survey of all institutions and measures existing in European countries for assisting foreign university professors and students, and for promoting study and teaching abroad." The book is the result of an investigation suggested and financed by the American Council on Education and carried out by the University Relations Section of the International Institute.

NEW RHODES SCHOLARSHIP PLAN.—The Rhodes trustees are promoting a bill in Parliament enlarging the powers conferred upon

them under the will of Cecil Rhodes. The principal purpose of the bill will be to enable them to give effect to a proposal which has been made to them by an overwhelming majority of old American Rhodes scholars, supported by a similar majority of authorities in education, including the members of the Association of American Universities, the Association of Urban Universities, and the Association of American Colleges.

The proposal is that for the purpose of choosing the thirty-two scholars annually appropriated under the will to the United States, the country should be divided into eight districts of six states each, with a competition held in every state every year instead of in only two years out of every three, as at present. Each state selection committee would be allowed to nominate one or two scholars to appear before the regional selection committee. Each regional selection committee would then appoint from among the candidates they sent forward the best four. This method would ensure a geographical distribution of the scholarships among the different parts of the United States approximately as at present, though it would no longer guarantee to every state an equal number of appointments but it would fit in far better with the academic system of the country, would make selection easier, and tend to ensure that all candidates chosen were of the highest standard.

The bill proposes to give to the trustees discretion to organize the distribution and tenure of scholarships in the United States as they may from time to time consider will best fulfil the purposes of the testator, and to create a capital reserve fund behind the scholarship system.

BRITISH DEBATERS IN AMERICA.—Debating teams from Oxford and Cambridge have visited the United States in recent years and engaged in contests with many American colleges. A British University Women's team is here this winter for the first time. One member is from Oxford, one from Cambridge, and one from the University of London. They are touring the southern and central western states. An Oxford team of men is visiting colleges from Maine to Maryland and as far west as Ohio, while a team from the University of Sydney, Australia, is debating with colleges in California and the southwest.

SCHOOL AND SOCIETY AND THE EDUCATIONAL REVIEW.—*School and Society* and the *Educational Review* have been combined, and will

in future be published weekly, by the Science Press, under the editorship of J. McKeen Cattell with the cooperation of William McAndrew. The first combined issue was that of November 1.

The *Educational Review* was established in 1891 by Nicholas Murray Butler, now President of Columbia University, and was under his editorial direction for twenty-nine years. Frank P. Graves, formerly Dean of the School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania and now New York State Commissioner of Education, acted as editor for four years, after which time William McAndrew, recently Superintendent of the Chicago Schools, became editor.

School and Society was established in 1915, and since its founding has been edited by Dr. Cattell. During its history it has absorbed the *School Journal*, established in 1874, and *The Teacher's Magazine*, established in 1878.

BRITISH UNIVERSITIES REVIEW.—*The University Bulletin* issued by the British Association of University Teachers has become *The Universities Review*. "Although not altogether accurate and rather ambitious," says an editorial note, "the new name has at least the advantage of being free from that suggestion of gloom and impending dissolution associated with the word bulletin. *The Universities Review* will contain the reports of the Association as they are produced as well as the other routine material connected with its work. An increasing amount of space, however, will be devoted to articles of general interest to those connected with university teaching and administration. We believe, moreover, that there is scope for a journal one of whose main objects is to make the universities of the Empire better known to each other."

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE A

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE.—In June, 1928, an investigation was conducted at the South Dakota State College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts (Brookings, South Dakota) on behalf of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. For the information of the Association's members, Professor H. R. Fairclough, Chairman of Committee A, thus summarizes the facts leading up to the investigation and the report of the investigating committee:

Dr. J. A. Williams came to South Dakota State College in the autumn of 1921 as Professor of Education. At that time the head of the institution was President Willis E. Johnson. In the autumn of 1923, Dr. Charles W. Pugsley became President. On March 30, 1927, President Pugsley informed Dr. Williams by letter that activities and expenditures in the Department of Education might have to be curtailed in the immediate future. Shortly thereafter, President Pugsley and Dean George L. Brown told Dr. Williams that he would be dropped from the Faculty at the end of the academic year 1927-28. On December 17, 1927, Dean Brown by letter positively confirmed this oral notice. Dr. Williams then requested a hearing before the Board of Regents, and January 20, 1928, was assigned for the hearing. On this date one of the regents in a preliminary conference made statements and suggestions to Dr. Williams which led the latter to conclude that at least some of the Board members had already decided his case against him. He also concluded from this conference that the Board had made no preparation for anything in the nature of a formal, organized hearing. He therefore asked for and was granted an opportunity to speak informally to the Board. He was later informed that the Board had voted to sustain the action of President Pugsley and Dean Brown.

Dr. Williams next laid his case before the Association, and after correspondence between the Secretary and President Pugsley it was decided to conduct an investigation. Dr. J. H. Shepperd, Chairman of the Animal Husbandry Department of North Dakota State College, and Dr. Paul Emerson, Associate Professor of Soils of Iowa State College, consented to act as an investigating committee. They reached Brookings on the evening of June 12, 1928, and began their hearings on the following day. At the close of the first day's work an unexpected emergency compelled Dr. Shepperd to withdraw

from active participation. Dr. Emerson continued with great vigor, carrying on interviews day and night, and completed the investigation by noon of June 16, 1928. Over thirty witnesses, presenting all aspects of the controversy, were heard, and much written evidence was considered. The investigating committee has deposited with the Chairman of Committee A the entire record of evidence, and has also presented a written report which is hereafter in part summarized and in part quoted verbatim.

The investigating committee makes a general finding that the alleged reasons for dropping Dr. Williams (which have never previously been stated in comprehensive form) were vague and not substantiated by the evidence. Incidentally, the committee found that some of these reasons were based on happenings after December 17, 1927, when Dr. Williams received his written notice from Dean Brown. The committee also touches upon the various reasons separately. (1) A charge was made that Dr. Williams had not paid his debts. While some evidence supported this charge, the explanation given by Dr. Williams satisfied the committee, and in any event the charge is remote from the vital issues. (2) It was also charged that Dr. Williams had been unpopular among the students. The evidence indicated some unpopularity at an earlier date, but respect and liking for Dr. Williams at all times by the better students, and a substantial change of general student opinion in his favor before the time of the investigation. (3) Dr. Williams was charged with having made speeches which reacted unfavorably on the institution. This meant nothing more than that some of his public addresses had not interested all his auditors. The evidence presented to the committee clearly indicated that Dr. Williams did not gossip about conditions at South Dakota State College, and that he had not criticized the administration of the College in public speeches. (4) Dr. Williams was charged with being out of sympathy with the curtailment of educational work at the institution and with lack of interest in the vocational side of education which was there stressed. No evidence presented to the investigating committee tended to sustain this charge, and a substantial amount of evidence tended to refute it. (5) There were two charges involving friction between Dr. Williams and other officers or departments of the institution. It did appear that in some respects Dr. Williams had shown lack of tact, but the committee's finding is that so far as friction existed, he was not primarily or mainly at fault. Much evidence indicated

that Dr. Williams was highly regarded at the college and among the townspeople as a man and an educator. (6) It was stated that lack of funds had necessitated Dr. Williams' dismissal. This assertion did not seem convincing to the committee. Dr. Williams' salary was \$4000; the salary of his successor is \$3600.

It is the committee's conclusion that the real cause of Dr. Williams' dismissal was antipathy between him and President Pugsley. No single overt act gave rise to this attitude. The evidence indicated a gradual accumulation of features which intensified President Pugsley's determination to drop Dr. Williams. In this point the committee reports as follows: "Dr. Williams is in every respect an educator. President Pugsley is in every respect an administrator from the financial viewpoint. The former had certain ideals that could not be supported or were not supported by the latter. . . .Dr. Williams' insistence on the raising of standards, coupled with a possible lack of tact, possible lack of support by his dean, possible antagonism on the part of the Home Economics dean, led to decided opposition among his colleagues. . . .The evidence tends to center about the personalities of the two men concerned and appears insufficient to warrant the drastic action taken. . . .It appears to your committee that criticism of Dr. Williams [along the foregoing lines] in reality reflects to his credit and ability. From this angle your committee feels that an unfair personal advantage has been taken of the power of the yearly contract; further, that in dismissing Dr. Williams, President Pugsley has wronged South Dakota State College by depriving her of an educator and by introducing or rather exciting an existing fear regarding tenure. . . ."

The foregoing mention of the annual contract leads up to the most significant portion of the report. By state law, employment at South Dakota State College is from year to year only. The observations of the committee with respect to the effect of this rule are as follows: "There is no question but that the administration has a powerful weapon over the faculty in the form of the one-year contract. There is no evidence that this contract has ever been terminated without warning. . . .[But its existence and], the power that its existence implies, the manner of its administration, and its historical background have tended to create a decided spirit of indecision leading to unrest and fear. . . ."

"Apparently, academic freedom and tenure at South Dakota State College are limited according to the will and wishes of the President

and the Deans. The existence of the contract creates a condition that affects the whole faculty from the President to the lowest janitor and any individual working [at the College] for a living would naturally be interested in its operation. In some cases there is a feeling that it is merely a matter of form; in others there is a decided question regarding security, amounting to a condition where there is a hesitancy to purchase property. In some cases there is a feeling that one is always on the verge of being let out. The feeling seems to be that it is not accomplishment along educational lines that tends towards security of tenure, but rather the question whether one has done or said something to offend the administrative officers.

"Apparently there is little attempt on the part of the administrative officers to adjust differences. In fact, it appears that when such differences occur, the complainant may be dismissed simply by not recommending the renewal of the contract.

"Naturally, such a powerful weapon, administered in such a manner, very effectively limits freedom of speech."

H. R. FAIRCLOUGH, Chairman Committee A

REVIEWS

FACING LIFE, by W. H. P. Faunce, Macmillan Company.—Dr. Faunce, President of Brown University, has gathered together into a charming little volume forty-nine very brief addresses made to the students of his University at the morning chapel service. They cover a wide range of topics. Ten introduce the freshmen to the college world and its problems and opportunities. Another group discusses the Christian faith in its relations to modern thought. There is an essay on "The Cure for Loneliness" and another on "The Power to Focus" and another for "Before Examinations." It would be hard to conceive of greater tact, skill, and delicacy than have gone into the making of these little addresses; and one can sincerely congratulate the students whose mornings were begun with them. In the mind of Dr. Faunce modernism and conservatism, idealism and common sense, culture and character, lie down together.

It is hard to give a sample of a book so persistently quotable, but perhaps the opening paragraph from the last of the talks to freshmen will suggest as well as another the genuinely inspiring tone of the book:

"That is the Old Testament description of old age: 'They shall be afraid of that which is high.' It appears, then, that age and decrepitude are not determined by the calendar, but by one's attitude toward life. How old are you, really? The answer must be given not in years and days, but in temper and disposition. Whoever says: 'That is true, but I dare not acknowledge it; that is right, but I cannot live up to it'—he is in his dotage, whether his years be seventeen or seventy. Whoever says: 'That is right and true, and therefore at all hazards I follow it'—he is young and to be reckoned with."

This wise counselor must be of much help to the classes of Brown men as they prepare for "facing life."

AUSTIN WARREN

THE ENGINEER, by R. L. Sackett.—The vocational counselor and the parent will find in Dean Sackett's book, *The Engineer*, many data requisite for forming a picture of the education and work of the architect and engineer. After emphasizing the haphazard way in which the majority make their choice of vocation, this book presents an interesting second chapter which makes very plain the kind of mental aptitude and interest the candidate in technology should

possess, and also adds information to answer the perennial question regarding engineering incomes. There follows a brief history of engineering which recounts the achievements of the civil and structural engineer at rather greater length than is perhaps just to their confrères in other fields. The college course in engineering is described with emphasis on the increasing recognition given by the profession to the subjects of history, of political and economic science, and of English. Eight short chapters outline the work of the architect and of the architectural, civil, electrical, mechanical, industrial, chemical, and mining engineers with brief comment on certain other fields. After a few pages devoted to the activities of the technical teacher and research worker, the book proper concludes with a chapter entitled "The Aesthetic, Cultural, and Romantic in Engineering." The point of view is made plain by the definition given for culture, "the training, disciplining, or refining of the moral and the intellectual nature—refinement in manner and taste." Consistent with this is the statement that the bed rock of technical education is cultural: mathematics and physics provide discipline and give knowledge of scientific subjects which form a considerable part of our literature. In the appendix are gathered biographical accounts of twelve "engineers who have made history," beginning with Da Vinci and concluding with Hoover, Hammond, and Schwab.

Those who believe that an essential of culture is sympathetic understanding of the human environment, both in the field of personal relationship and more urgently in the broader matters of social grouping and organization, will find in the book too little recognition of social evolution, the rise of the business class and the labor movement. So long as attention is focussed on the material changes brought about by the industrial evolution, and so long as culture is identical merely with literary attainments, we cannot expect to see our engineering graduates attain social leadership.

Aside from this lack, which may be virtue to many conservative minds, the book is valuable. However, it should not be put in the hand of the high school student except as adjunct to personal interviews, for the matter is so condensed in places and replete with statistical and other data as to be heavy going for the immature.

HALE SUTHERLAND

WHICH COLLEGE? by Rita S. Halle, Macmillan Company.—Mrs. Halle has produced a very useful little book intended primarily to

be of service to secondary school students and their parents in search of a college, but serviceable also as a work of reference to all who wish reliable information about our institutions of higher learning. The institutions characterized are arranged into four groups—colleges for men, for women, for both sexes, for negroes. The names were taken from the accredited list of the Association of American Universities and the several regional associations. The information given concerning each institution—the size of the student body, of the faculty, of the library, of the campus, of the endowment; the number and character of the units required for admission; the tuition fee; the special schools and degrees, if any; the opportunities for self-support and for scholarships—has been compiled from questionnaires sent each institution and from college catalogues, and the final statement has in each case been checked by the officers of the institution.

Prefatory to the "Which is Which" are provided four chapters of excellent counsel on "Which College," "How to Get There," "The Junior College," and "After College—What?" The first deals sensibly with the choice between the small and the large college, the college in the country and the college in the city. On the latter alternative Mrs. Halle observes, "Any choice should take into account the previous environment as well as the nature of the individual student. If a boy or girl has spent his early life in a small community, it is well for him to spend his student years in or near a large city, where he may have such cultural advantages as access to music and art and outside lectures. . . . If a student has spent his early life in a city, he would do well to choose a college away from the sights and sounds of a town, in a place where he can have the simpler and more intimate life of the country, the opportunity to get close to nature and human nature. A college in a small community is likely to be more self-dependent for its activities, to be more unified in its interests, to have more college spirit." "How to Get There," deals with entrance requirements and the various methods of admission. The longest of the four chapters, "After College—What?" gives useful lists of professional and vocational schools connected with the universities and colleges listed.

Mrs. Halle has made a book which ought to be of real service to all who are interested in choosing the right college.

AUSTIN WARREN

SMALL COLLEGES AND TEACHER TRAINING, by Jacob G. Meyer, The Public School Publishing Co., Bloomington, Illinois.—Dr.

Meyer's book is a plea for the greater utilization of the small liberal arts college as a supplier of secondary school teachers. The normal schools are unable to fulfil the demand. "One hundred and seventeen thousand new teachers are needed annually [in the secondary schools] and not more than one-third of this number are graduated annually from all teacher training schools." Meanwhile, "All facts indicate that there is an increasing tendency for college graduates to enter the teaching profession and that this tendency has been growing. . . . This growth has been more rapid the last two five-year periods than during any preceding five-year period."

In Chapter V, Dr. Meyer discusses the present equipment of the small college for its task of teacher training. Of the one hundred and eighty colleges he studied, one hundred and seventy offered courses in education. The colleges do not, however, meet the standard of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which requires forty per cent of all curricular studies pursued by prospective teachers to be in the field of education. At present, Dr. Meyer admits, "the tendency [of the small colleges] is clearly in the direction of not requiring more ['education'] than is absolutely necessary to meet the minimum state requirements." Dr. Meyer, who is Dean of the School of Education in Manchester College, Indiana, and naturally disposed to value the magnifying of "education," is dissatisfied with this "tendency," and believes that the liberal arts colleges should put on "in all seriousness at least a high school teacher training program that would not only meet the minimum state requirements but which will even surpass the Carnegie standard."

By way of digression Dr. Meyer makes interesting use of the work of Swift, Rashdall, and Paetow to refute the scruples of old-fashioned humanists who object to the introduction of "education" into the arts curriculum and to the granting of the A.B. degree to graduates in "education." Dr. Meyer reminds us that "the earliest use made of the term bachelor was as a title given to pupil teachers at medieval universities where the only real teachers were the bachelors."

AUSTIN WARREN

EDUCATION FOR WORLD-CITIZENSHIP, by William G. Carr, Stanford University Press.—Professor Carr's aim is "to organize the best published thought on the educational aspects of world-citizenship, to demonstrate the value and necessity of education for international

good-will, and to indicate some of the ways in which schools and teachers may help the world to move toward the goal desired by all intelligent people—the attainment of world harmony and peace." The book is said to be "the first extended publication" in its field.

The writer is quite frankly an internationalist and a pacifist. His position may, it would seem, be fairly expressed in the celebrated dictum which he attributes to Franklin, "There never was a good war or a bad peace." "If there is no analysis offered [in the history class] of the political and economic situation out of which wars grow, nor of their spiritual, moral, physical, and financial cost to the world, the discussion is inadequate." Chapter V denies that man has a fighting *instinct*, asserting that fighting is only a habit (and, we suppose, a bad habit). In consequence, "Our efforts as teachers of world-citizenship need not be directed to the eradication or sublimation of a deeply rooted instinct but simply to the formation of habits of peaceful living." Chapter VII, on "Military Training in the Schools," concludes that: "Most of the stated aims of military training have been shown to be met by other subjects. . . . In short, military training in schools cannot be justified as an educational agency."

The most interesting and suggestive chapters of this interesting and suggestive book deal with the inculcation of "world-citizenship" through the classes in geography and history. What is said upon these topics is very much in agreement with Mr. Bertrand Russell's views as put forth in *Education and the Good Life*. "Human" geography is to take precedence over "political:" the "life and customs of a foreign people are more important subjects for study than the details of political geography." The history class must be international rather than nationalistic in point of view. "Patriotism should never be taught so as to make it the meanest of all the virtues." Not only must chauvinism disappear from the attitude of the teacher and the textbook, but the emphasis upon wars as the *principal parts* of history must also disappear. "The causes of wars may throw light on modern problems. But the technical details of the prosecution of wars have no value whatever to the general student. To teach them is to squander time." It is encouraging to be told, as Professor Carr does tell us, that the amount of space given to wars by our history textbooks has been diminished from fifty per cent in 1860 to twenty-five per cent in 1920. The chapter includes useful material on the "notable position of leadership taken by the United States in the movement to establish world order."

Our universities have of course never suffered from chauvinism as much as our secondary schools; Mayor Thompson's authority does not extend beyond the boundaries of Chicago. In the universities, too, it has long been the custom to stress the social interpretation of history. The comfort of this book lies in the assurance that secondary school students are also, increasingly, to be taught that they are first of all citizens of the world.

AUSTIN WARREN

EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

LOGIC AND PERSUASION.—Ever since the time of Socrates and Plato there has been dispute concerning the place of rhetoric in our educational systems. As the centuries passed, rhetoric, or, to use the modern and less ambiguous term, persuasion, has been the victim of many bitter attacks. These attacks have varied somewhat in wording, but the underlying argument has been the same. One of the most forceful statements of this traditional view has been made recently by Professor Paul Shorey, speaking at a convocation at the University of the State of New York.

"... But if we take rhetoric in its truer and broader sense as a misuse of any kind of fallacy, irrelevance, ornament, emotion, suggestion, wit, epigram, to gain some undue advantage over sober reason and fact, then there never has been a time in the history of mankind when the power of rhetoric was so great. . . . The neglect of such study of rhetoric in our education is very surprising in view of the enormous and increasing part played by public speaking, directly, or in report and broadcast, in the formation of that public opinion which is the master of us all. You will perhaps doubt this neglect. . . . What I really mean is not that we don't study rhetoric in a fashion, but that we don't study it in the right way. . . . The dominant aim in all university teaching of these subjects (propaganda and advertisement, and their chief instrument, rhetoric, in all its manifold disguises) should be the establishment of a resisting immunity. It is no legitimate function of public education to teach men how to overreach and overpersuade their fellows. It is the proper task to enlighten and harden the minds of those who make up the staple of audiences against such attempts. I have no time to prove that exploitation is in fact the spirit of our teaching of such subjects as rhetoric, public speaking, psychology, advertising, education and even history. It is a patent fact. . . ."

Here, obviously, is an issue not to be ignored. To meet it squarely we must determine with scientific objectivity the place of persuasive methods in our twentieth century civilization. Two questions inevitably demand answers. In light of all the accredited findings of modern psychology, must we conclude that persuasion is unnecessary to social progress? And if it is necessary, should persuasive methods be taught in our schools? In seeking answers to these questions we find that for once—and perhaps the only time—psychologists are

not divided in their theories concerning the fundamental basis of human behavior. Present-day psychologists are split into many schools and factions, but upon one thing they are unanimous—that most people are guided almost entirely by their desires, their emotions, and their habits—by what the teacher of persuasion calls the “impelling motives.” Mere logic, “sober reason and fact,” will never move them very far. Life is a battle, an adventure, a possibility, and it is doubtful whether even the college professor is entirely motivated by sober reason. True, few will deny that facts, evidence, and logic are valuable aids to persuasion. They give strength and permanency to an appeal. We should certainly train our students to present the fundamental issues of any question clearly and logically whenever they speak or write. . . . The defensive training against anti-social appeals would undoubtedly be beneficial, but we should not and we dare not stop with that. If in their speaking and writing our students are to limit themselves strictly to logic and argumentation, they will succeed only in making the better cause appear the worse. If we are willing thus to incapacitate them, we must remain content to see society governed and directed by other than educated men. . . .

The twentieth century, we are told, is an age of specialists. But we know only too well that in many of its most important functions society is directed not by experts, but by men who possess either the ability to win the support of other people, or the financial means to employ publicity men, advertising managers, newspaper editors, and effective public speakers who will be persuasive for them. The specialist has dignity and knowledge on his side, but to gain the ascendancy he must present that knowledge, by speech and in print, in a manner pleasing to the public mind. Unless he is able to do this, the expert must continue to occupy a third or fourth rate position in our social order. When he can enrich his employers, as does a chemist, he will be given some recognition, but when he has only social service for his aim, as in sociology, the ineloquent specialist will be heeded only within his classroom, and not really heeded even there by a majority of his students. His position is a difficult one, for the specialist can never hope to present his knowledge to a popular audience in a comprehensive and understandable manner. Those few who can understand him will themselves be specialists or semi-specialists. Most people must be reached more persuasively; they should be inspired with a respect which must, of necessity, be

partly an emotional reaction. This respect will give the specialist a reasonable freedom of action, just as we now allow doctors to operate upon us when we have only a faint conception of the medical practices involved. . . .

Thus does a realistic survey of conditions show us that if we are to gain the maximum of social progress, the teachers of public speaking and persuasion must come inevitably to hold a more prominent position in our educational systems than they do at present. The day is not far away when every progressive school system will include this invaluable training. If this country is to advance under the leadership of educated men, our students must be trained in the methods of leadership, which consist, in no small measure, in writing and speaking effectively. Nor should we forget that persuasion is of even greater importance as a complement to professional training. That is the reason the schools of engineering at Purdue University require all their engineering students to register for a fundamental course in public speaking and persuasion. And when we consider that departments of speech are growing rapidly in hundreds of colleges and universities, and that more and more secondary schools are including public speaking as a required course, taught by instructors carefully trained in the methodology of that subject—when we consider these wide-spread changes we realize that educators generally are becoming aware of the importance of persuasion. Surely this is a hopeful sign that the social order of the future will be directed by men who know both what should be done and how to induce others to aid in doing it.

EDWIN H. PAGET, Syracuse University,
School and Society

TEACHING AND THE PH.D.—. . . Material for this type of distributions was secured from three of the large private institutions and from three state universities. The data for the University of California were furnished in tabulated form by Dean Charles B. Lipman, Miss A. B. Flournoy, and Miss Carmel D. Riley. For Harvard, Princeton, Chicago, Johns Hopkins, and Wisconsin use was made of printed alumni lists, and the Minnesota material was taken directly from the records in the office of the Graduate School. . . .

The degree to which research is the major occupation may be gleaned by a study of the separate columns in which research workers are listed. If we include the *research foundations* column, which

probably designates administrative officers as well as technical workers, there are seven of these columns. Of the total of 5789 doctors from the seven institutions, 711, or 12.3 per cent, describe their work as that of research. The Chicago data are not distributed, but if this were done the percentage would be approximately 16.4. Slightly less than 3 per cent are expert workers in government service, local, state, and national. . . .

The bearing of these data upon the objectives and administration of graduate schools is a matter that may claim some attention from these training institutions, and, as well, from those other institutions which consume their products. There is a wide-spread conception of the graduate school as an agency for the promotion of research and the training of research workers. The almost universal requirement of the research thesis and the evidence of capacity for productive scholarship as prerequisites for the doctorate is testimony to the general devotion to this ideal.

If research were to be regarded as the exclusive aim of the graduate school or even as its primary objective, the present occupation of its graduates would seem eloquent testimony to its failure to achieve its intention. Either the market for researchers is too limited to absorb the ever increasing output, or the quality of the men at the end of training is inadequate to prevent wholesale abortion of good intentions. One may have his choice of explanations, but the evidence is clear that American graduate schools are not confined to the production of research workers. Primarily, they are doing other things. This finding is in line with widely held opinion, and is supported by every study of the problem which has been made. Jerne-gan, from his recent study of the productivity of history doctorates, infers that about 25 per cent are productive after receiving the doctorate. The other 75 per cent are teachers only or are engaged in non-educational work.

Since these data have an important relevancy to the character of American college and university faculties they may be related to the results of a recent investigation reported (1928) by a committee of the North Central Association. This study gives the facts for one hundred sixty-three colleges and universities having 8743 faculty members. Of this total, 2968, or 33.9 per cent, have the doctor's degree. Five thousand seven hundred seventy-five, or 66.1 per cent, have less training, 58.1 per cent have no more than a master's degree, and 24.8 per cent only a bachelor's degree. For twenty-three

representative universities and thirty-five representative colleges the figures are slightly higher—72.4 per cent of doctors for the universities and 49.8 per cent for the colleges.

If research as a major interest claims so meager a portion of the doctors as our study shows, then it is clear that in faculties claiming so small a fraction of doctors the business of research is all but negligible. The truth is that *these faculties are teaching faculties* engaged with students who are too immature for the business of investigation, and with bodies of information that are far short of the frontiers of knowledge. It is also true that almost without exception these faculties have had no training for research in the activity which claims all but a fraction of their time and energy, namely, in the problems of education. While some of them are sufficiently trained to conduct research in the subject matter of their choice, if the conditions of their employment encouraged such activity, they are wholly without technical skills or the essential attitudes for investigation in the main occupation of their lives. They produce nothing of value in subject-matter fields because either the essential initiative or the conditions are lacking. They add nothing to our knowledge of education because they have never learned how to do it. . . .

In view of the fact that teaching is the predominant occupational destination of Ph.D. recipients, it is pertinent to inquire what the graduate schools are doing to prepare students for their future business. The present study provides no material answer to this query, but in the study already noted it appeared that their efforts are confined to two things: the exploitation of subject matter with the techniques of scholarship relevant thereto, and some form of apprentice teaching. Practically nothing is done by way of specific instruction for the business of college teaching, and there is evidence of hostility on the part of some graduate schools to such instruction. The reasons usually given for failure to require or even to offer such instruction are lack of time on the part of the student, the absence of need for such instruction, or the inconsequential character of what students of education can offer to the aspiring doctor.

To the host of college instructors that engage in this enterprise the American graduate schools add an army of young doctors each year. Does this increment of teaching personnel add anything of professional equipment of college faculties? Apparently not.

The writer has no intention of debating this issue in the present paper beyond calling attention to certain easily understood facts.

In about four hundred American colleges and universities attempts are being made this year to improve the education provided for students. In the main these attempts center about four problems, *the curriculum, methods of teaching, organization and administration, and the abilities and interests of students*. It is fair to say that for the most part the persons who are attempting these improvements have had no specific training for the work they are undertaking other than that gained in the graduate schools. This, with native ability and "experience," makes the total equipment of these would-be-improvers of American education. Their psychology, generally gained at second hand, is usually more popular than profound, and they are curiously free from any belief that there are "principles" of curriculum construction.

It may fairly be asked whether the time has not arrived to face squarely the obvious facts. The graduate schools of American universities are essentially teacher training institutions and upon the kind of training which they offer and require of their doctorate candidates will depend the character of our college faculties and the quality of college education. Is it too much to ask that in this program of graduate training the student should be required to give some attention to the problems of education—problems which will constitute the student's chief concern once he is launched on his professional career?

M. E. HAGGERTY, University of Minnesota,
Educational Record

WOMEN AND THE PH.D.—Two years ago, at the suggestion of the American Association of University Women, the Bureau of Vocational Information made a study of women who have received the degree of doctor of philosophy from American colleges and universities up to and including June, 1924. Of nearly sixteen hundred women whose names were obtained from the registrar or alumni secretary of the colleges and universities that confer this degree, nearly two-thirds generously responded by filling out the questionnaire and thus put their experience at the service of others. . . . The following summary brings together briefly the general results of the study. . . . Thirty-nine different colleges were represented. . . . Columbia and Chicago lead in the number of degrees conferred upon women, followed closely by Yale, Cornell, Pennsylvania, and Bryn Mawr.

The fields of work show both dispersion and concentration. Forty-eight different subjects were reported, ranging from art to zoology. Nearly two-thirds of the degrees, however, had been received in botany, chemistry, English, history, Latin and Greek, mathematics, philosophy, psychology, and zoology. A larger number had the degree in English and in psychology than in any other subjects. If the fields of study are divided into groups—languages, literatures, and other fine arts; natural sciences and mathematics; and social sciences—certain trends in women's intellectual interests may be observed which indicate that women have been turning from the more beaten paths of study in languages and literatures to the natural sciences and mathematics. The proportion of women receiving the degree in the former group declined from forty-five per cent in the years 1877 to 1904, to twenty-five per cent from 1915 to 1924.

From their statements, it appears that women have been inspired to work for the degree as much by the single desire for more information and intellectual training in a subject that is of great interest to them—by the love of learning for learning's sake—as by a combination of this desire with the utilitarian or vocational purpose. But there is a noteworthy change in the reasons given by earlier and later recipients of the degree. Those who received the Ph.D. up to 1890 gave only what may be called the idealistic motive, absorbing interest in their subject. After that year the vocational reason appears, and year by year there has been a steady and significant increase in the numbers who combine the two types of motive, until at present the women who work for the degree for vocational reasons, in part at least, exceed in number those who seek only learning for its own sake. Since 1920 an increasing number have been prompted solely by vocational motives.

The vocational value of the degree is reflected in the holders' occupational interests. Nearly six hundred were teachers, five-sixths of whom were in college or university positions; one hundred and ten held administrative or executive positions, chiefly in educational institutions; eighty were engaged in research; and nearly seventy were engaged in other work of varied types. Of the entire number studied, one hundred and sixty—fifteen per cent—were without gainful occupation, but even these women had almost all been gainfully employed before marrying, or had worked until the age of retirement. In the teaching profession a comparison of the positions held by women before and after receiving the degree shows a

marked coincidence of promotion in rank with the receiving of the degree.

The importance attached to the degree is reflected in the sacrifices made to secure it. Preparation for the final examinations and work on the required dissertation had been spread over five, six, seven, and more years. Many had combined graduate study with part-time and even full-time work in teaching. Some had alternated years of teaching and saving with months or, occasionally, a year of study. A few had borrowed the necessary money. Nearly seventy per cent had had scholarships or fellowships, but these had not been sufficient to meet all expenses. Only occasionally did any writer express a sense of ease in carrying the cost of getting the degree. The interval between the first degree and the Ph.D. ranged from two to thirty-five years. In about one-half the records eight years or less had elapsed. Over seventy per cent of the women had received more than one graduate degree.

The occupational experience of teachers was limited almost exclusively to teaching. Those with the rank of full professor had taught on the average over fifteen years in college or university. Nearly fifty per cent had had all of their experience in one institution. Those who had taught the longest had remained in the same college or university. Associate or assistant professors had taught on the average nearly eleven years. More than one-half of them had had all their experience in one institution. One-half of the teachers reported no break in their occupational experience while getting the degree.

The conditions attending the selection and writing of the thesis were varied. More than one-half of those who reported on the choosing of a subject said it had been assigned by the professor in charge of their work. About one-fourth had chosen their own subjects. . . . Very few expressed any pleasure or satisfaction in the work for the thesis.

The salaries of women with the Ph.D. degree ranged from less than \$750 to \$15,000. The median salary was \$2732. Nearly eighty per cent of the women reporting received salaries between \$1750 and \$3750. The lowest incomes were reported by those engaged in part-time work or in mission colleges. The highest income, \$15,000, was reported by a physician. In the group as a whole the highest salaries were received by those with the longest occupational experience, but there is reason to think from the records that salary

increases, characteristic of the last ten years, have benefited most those with the shortest occupational experience. Salaries were higher in administrative and executive positions than in other types of salaried work. . . .

Over three-fourths of the women occupied in other types of work stated that they had some degree of opportunity for research after receiving the Ph.D. Over fifteen per cent said they had had no opportunity at all. Only ninety women had held fellowships after their graduate work had been completed, and less than one hundred reported having had any leave of absence that would enable them to carry on research.

Thirty per cent of those who had had some opportunity for research had published nothing except the dissertation required for the Ph.D. Seventeen per cent had published work of a varied sort not to be classified as research—textbooks, manuals, syllabi, book reviews, translations, fiction, poetry. Fifty-three per cent had published some work—for the most part original articles in scientific journals—that would be considered productive scholarship. In a few instances both books and articles of this type had been published.

About three-fourths of those who had attempted to carry on research were stimulated by the love of the work itself. The others indicated that vocational reasons—the prospect of appointment or promotion—had also played their part.

By far the most important obstacle to research was stated to be the demands of the position held. Next in importance were personal reasons, such as lack of interest or lack of confidence in one's research ability, and family reasons. . . .

Three-fourths of the women were single, over one-fifth were married, and the others were widowed, divorced, or separated from their husbands. Of the one-fifth who were married about one-half were combining marriage with a career. It appears from their records that those who take the degree after marrying are more likely to combine gainful employment with marriage. The women who make this combination have, on the average, as many children as those who do not. They are slightly older and have had a somewhat longer occupational experience before marriage than those who do not attempt to carry on after marriage in the positions they formerly held. In the last ten years there appears a growing tendency to attempt the combination of marriage and a career. . . .

Only seventy-one out of the more than a thousand women report-

ing said they would not advise others to take the degree. A few advised it with certain reservations bearing upon the financial burden involved, or upon the intellectual fitness and the physical strength of the candidate. But nearly three-fourths recommended it without any qualification.

Teachers, with the exception of those in secondary schools and the women engaged in research, almost unanimously advised having the degree. Three-fourths of those in administrative or executive positions also emphasized its importance. It would appear from their comment that the degree is practically a prerequisite for the higher teaching positions in the larger colleges and universities, and it is without question a requirement for a research position of any importance. The opinion is fairly general in this group, however, that a rigorous selective process should be used by the universities and colleges conferring the degree to eliminate those candidates who have no sound scholarly interests and aptitudes, and those who are taking the degree primarily for its real or fancied commercial value.

It was only among those engaged in other types of work, such as writers, physicians, librarians, social workers, and business women, that any real difference of opinion was found as to the desirability of the degree. Barely three-fifths of these women advised others to take the degree for its value in their particular work, and more than one-fifth strongly advised against it. The strongest reaction against taking the degree was expressed by those engaged in creative literary work.

A majority of those who had given up their professional careers at marriage advised others not to take the degree. This appears to have been largely because they felt it had little bearing upon the family relationships, and the time, money, and energy devoted to it would have been spent better in other ways. A substantial minority, however, felt glad to have the degree even in these circumstances for its general intellectual and cultural value, and not infrequently a woman looked upon marriage as interrupting but not terminating her professional career.

Advice as to the time when the degree should be taken resolved itself into the general statement that study for the Ph.D. should not follow immediately after undergraduate work, but that it should not be postponed for more than a few years at most. There was a distinct consensus of opinion that work for the degree should not be undertaken after the late twenties or very early thirties. In general,

the opinion was held that the college graduate should secure some practical experience before entering upon the work for the higher degree, largely to test her interest in prolonged study and to bring a more mature point of view into graduate work. . . .

Finally, there was a considerable amount of additional comment in which the following points stand out: the danger to scholarship in the growing numbers who are getting the Ph.D. degree partly or exclusively for its commercial value; the need for two higher degrees of the grade of the Ph.D., one standing for advanced preparation for teaching, the other for research; the physical and mental strain of getting the degree; and the discrimination that many women find in appointment, promotion, and salary as they compete with men for positions for which the Ph.D. degree is required.

EMILIE J. HUTCHINSON, Barnard College,
Journal of the American Association of University Women

WHAT IS GRADUATE WORK?—The requirements for the doctorate in all of our universities are in terms of "graduate work." The requirements for the master's degree are commonly couched today in under-graduate measures of work—"thirty credits of graduate work" or "semester hours of graduate work;" "forty-five quarter credits of graduate work;" . . . At least thirty-one institutions use the undergraduate coupon-collecting terms in describing requirements for graduate degrees. All speak of "graduate work." What is this "graduate work" for which requirements are set up in one hundred and eighty-two institutions?

In one graduate school, a member of the Association of American Universities, a study of the registrations of two hundred and seventy students during the first semester and two hundred and seventy-nine during the second semester of 1926-27 showed that of one thousand eight hundred and forty-two course registrations six hundred and forty-three were in those called graduate, one thousand in senior courses, and one hundred and ninety-nine in junior courses. If the classification of courses is correct, it is a cause for careful consideration when sixty-five per cent of the graduate students are in senior college courses. . . . In this particular university it has been decided to indicate in the catalogue those upper-division courses which can be taken for graduate credit. Early indications are that each department, as usual in such cases, desires to list all its upper-division courses as acceptable for graduate work. The trouble is

that each department is in the scramble for graduate students and no department has a very clear notion of what differentiates an upper-division course from a graduate one. What is a graduate course?

At the 1926 meeting of this Association Dr. E. H. Wilkins pointed out that in the University of Chicago a study of ninety-one thousand course registrations by graduate students in the period from 1911 to 1923 made it clear that forty per cent were in courses designated as primarily "senior college courses." . . . It is clear that graduate students are not always pursuing progressively difficult courses, as undergraduates are required to do by carefully administered college regulations.

Some have protested because undergraduates are allowed to enter graduate courses. One dean of a graduate school, calling for a sharper differentiation between graduate and undergraduate courses, has said: "It is obvious that courses to which instructors seem willing to admit students who have not even eighteen majors cannot be of graduate caliber." To admit this, however, is not to admit that seniors or even juniors should be excluded from graduate courses. Chronological or academic age is less important than ability and preparation of the individual. Searching for gifted students, the colleges are discovering individual abilities and encouraging the growth of such abilities as rapidly as possible. To admit to graduate courses a few gifted students of proved achievement is a defensible policy quite different from that which allows supposedly competent graduate students to undertake work of undergraduate character. It is within the power of graduate faculties and their agents, the deans of graduate schools, to control either or both.

First, however, these authorities must define "graduate course." It is not enough to say, as one dean seriously proposed to me while I was studying our American educational terminology: "It is any course numbered from two hundred to three hundred in the Catalogue." . . .

There is need of a pronouncement by somebody. Who shall say what graduate study is? Who shall say what are the best opportunities for graduate study in our country? The North Central Association has had a committee on graduate degrees and has published a report already mentioned and voted to ask the Association of American Universities and the American Council on Education to undertake a study. . . . On Wednesday, February 27, 1901, the Association voted that "it is not desirable at present to interpret the

words 'graduate study.'” This is 1927. After twenty-six years has the Association of American Universities, with members which qualify because of their advanced and graduate instruction, acquired experience which will enable it to give the much-needed definition of graduate study or lead in such a cooperative study of a problem as our modern-foreign-language colleagues have carried on with such distinguished success? Surely in responding to the appeal for guidance there is an opportunity for a public service, not merely in setting up details of criteria, but in emphasizing the purpose for which universities exist—devotion to the search for truth.

DAVID ALLAN ROBERTSON,

Proceedings, Association of American Universities

PROFESSIONAL AND SEMI-PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS OR DIVISIONS AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL.¹—The universalizing of education through the elementary and secondary schools is recognized as the great American movement in the last century. The outstanding movement of the present century promises to be the building of a superstructure carrying higher education higher than it has ever been carried before on a large scale. The greatest growth in the large universities in the present century is in the graduate schools, and the ratio of this to the undergraduate expansion is going to increase for many years.

The most phenomenal sudden dash in the advancement of opportunities in higher education is the coming of the postdoctorate. As the general demand for the doctorate has increased rapidly within the last fifty years, so we are now on the first lap of the establishment of the postdoctorate studies as a qualification for learned careers and even for some professional careers. Indeed, there are probably more postdoctorate students in and from the United States at this time than there were candidates for the doctorate at the beginning of this century, and this movement affects not only pure science and art but also training in applied science and in the professions.

Some of the largest universities in this Association have already embarked upon a program of subdivision along professional lines in the graduate school, and others have for years maintained some degree of separate organization for the arts and for the sciences. Expansion in these directions seems inevitable with the great growth in graduate work that seems imminent. . . .

¹ Paper presented to the Association of American Universities

In making this plea for a study of the organization of graduate work I may indicate by way of illustration a few of the principles which it might be desirable to conserve.

I. *Definition of the Aims and Objectives within each Professional Field.*—If we need graduate training in law and commerce, in education and industry, in music and medicine, each of these fields should be surveyed in the light of recent spontaneous growth and in an effort to forecast future possibilities and objectives. Such a survey conducted by an adequate committee of this Association or a similar body for a period of years should do much to encourage expansion within these professional fields of higher learning, to secure allocation of funds for the development of these features, and to clear away a lot of rubbish and wasteful procedure now standing in the way of the serious student.

II. *Flexibility of Organization.*—There is no justifiable demand for fixed curricula or the building of high fences about intensive professional interests. There is little demand for courses, and it is exceedingly important that departmental fences shall be obliterated so that the man who is to be a professional in a particular field may have the fullest encouragement to reach out into any other field of learning in which his particular specialization may be grounded. All the laboratory and library resources and facilities of the institution should be at free disposal of each of these schools or divisions. The purpose of organization is to place responsibility for the promoting, motivating, and direction of the institution upon the men representing that profession.

III. *Degrees.*—As a means of stressing the principle that higher studies at this level should be of a liberal nature and in recognition of the enormous diversity of interests which might be represented by specific degrees, it would seem very desirable at the present time to retain the now standardized higher degrees, the master's degree and the doctorate, thus keeping in the foreground the idea of liberal studies as one of the chief aims of these types of graduate work. To the degree there might well be added the designation of the field, for example, Ph.D. in psychiatry.

Within each field there might well be recognized what might be the equivalent of different curricula, although not necessarily organized into courses. Some of these would lead to degrees or certificates and others would not. Such planning would enable the administration to lay down prerequisites and sequences in the order of sound progress.

IV. *A Common Graduate Board or Council.*—While the administration of a graduate school would by this means be split up into logical units for convenience and effectiveness in administration it is essential to the largest interests of the university to have a co-ordinating agency and a central organization within which each professional unit may act largely as a committee with power. It is possible, for example, that we should retain the organization now called the "graduate school," and designate each of these units as divisions, such as the Division of Medicine, the Division of Law, or the Division of Business Administration.

V. *Vertical Division of Organizations.*—It is very desirable that the organization which represents, for example, business administration, should have the continuous interests from the lowest provisions for undergraduate study in a subject up through the various levels of specialization leading to rich and intensive units of specialization and research. Thus, in each of these divisions there will be a natural well-organized dovetailing and bridging from one stage of professional training to another with provision for selective admission and order of sequences.

VI. *The Development of Service Features, Apprenticeships, and Co-operate Research.*—The school for the training of psychiatric, psychological, and social service, *e. g.*, might well consider the city or the state as its laboratory or the constituency for its clinics, and in turn the service of these clinics and laboratories might well reach out and recognize channels fostering cooperation between the school and the community.

VII. *Relation to Pure Science and Arts.*—In this conception we are carrying up to the graduate level the type of organization which has gradually developed at the undergraduate level, particularly in those units which furnish pre-professional training. The sciences and the humanities will still be in the central corps of the graduate school. The administration of these will, however, gradually become more specialized and therefore effective. The sciences and the humanities will be open fields to all professional students, and in a reciprocal manner research within the fields of pure arts and sciences will secure very great advantages with the privilege of contacts with applied arts and sciences in the professional and semi-professional divisions.

VIII. *Natural Transition and Landing Places.*—The program here indicated is in harmony with the proposal I have made elsewhere

with reference to the separation of the junior college and senior college for the purpose of securing a critical sorting place at the end of the sophomore year. In this plan of the vertical organization of divisions, the student will be received on the basis of placement examinations, re-sorted at the end of the sophomore year, re-sorted again at the end of the senior year, and again at the end of the organized training leading to the doctorate for admission to the postdoctorate study, so that the organization of various degrees of training in each field of a professional or semi-professional nature may be conceived and fostered in continuity by each professional interest for itself in the university.

C. E. SEASHORE, University of Iowa

"STANDARDS" AND THE TEACHING LOAD IN SCIENCE.—Among the "standards" for our colleges and schools formulated by various standardizing and accrediting agencies is usually to be found one that sets a maximum load for teachers. The unit in which the maximum is expressed is the lecture or recitation period. No standardizing agencies attempt in their formulation of standards to differentiate among the various subjects in estimating the teaching load, but some recognize the appropriateness of such differentiation in the administration of their provisions. A number do, however, attempt in their formulated standards to evaluate laboratory work, teaching of other types or auxiliary teaching services in terms of lecture or recitation periods. The evaluation of laboratory work is of peculiar interest to the scientist. It is the purpose of this paper to call the attention of scientists and educators to the fact that the evaluation of laboratory work when embodied in formal "standards" and in practice under less specific provisions is frequently unfair to the teacher of sciences and constitutes in certain cases a serious obstacle to effective teaching. . . .

Some may be found maintaining that the laboratory is the recreation ground of the teacher of science and that, far from being paid for his services there, he might reasonably be required himself to pay a fee in lieu, for instance, of dues in the country club. It is true that many scientists, by their devotion to the work in their laboratories, lend a certain apparent justification to this view, but it is fundamentally unsound. . . .

It may be admitted that laboratory work is not in every course, as concerns its contribution to the teacher's load, equivalent hour

for hour with lectures or recitations in every course; but any general assumption that the burden of laboratory teaching is less, hour for hour, than the burden of teaching of other types is utterly wrong. The knowledge that half pay is given by an institution for such work does not encourage the teacher to give his best to it; nor is it conducive in general to that respect which laboratory work should merit and receive. Laboratory teaching, like teaching of other types, is valuable to the pupil and worth while to the institution in proportion to the character and amount of the teacher's preparation for it, the spirit in which he approaches it, and the energy he puts into it. Every encouragement should be given him to make the most of his laboratory opportunities.

In view of these considerations attention may well be given to standards formulated by representative standardizing agencies. . . .

The oldest of our regional associations, the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, publishes no standards for either schools or colleges. In 1923 the association adopted "Minimum Requirements for an Acceptable College of Liberal Arts," which may fairly be taken as representing its position. The requirement of interest here is as follows: "The college should arrange the teaching schedules so that the total number of hours of any instructor shall vary according to the subject taught, not exceeding eighteen hours per week, including extension work and work in other institutions." No statement as to the practice followed in evaluating laboratory work under this requirement is available.

The Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, also, has published no policy regarding the weight given to hours of laboratory work in reckoning the teaching load of members of college faculties. In practice, their classification committee has, within ill-defined limits, accepted two hours of collegiate laboratory work as equivalent to one hour of lecture. . . .

The standard of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States, dealing with this matter in colleges of arts and sciences—is as follows: "Teaching schedules exceeding sixteen hours per week per instructor shall be interpreted as endangering educational efficiency. In general, two laboratory hours will be counted as equivalent to one recitation hour." . . .

The Catholic Education Association, through its commission on standardization of the department of colleges and secondary schools, accredits colleges only. It sets the usual limit of sixteen hours per

week for the teacher's load. Inspectors representing the commission are instructed to reckon one and one-half hours of laboratory work as the equivalent of one hour of lecture in estimating the load of the teacher.

Other agencies of classes mentioned, a number of the large universities, and most of the state departments of education recognize standards identical in phraseology or in effect with one or another of those mentioned above. The need for keeping the teaching load down to a reasonable point in order to make possible the maintenance of a high standard of scholarship in the teacher and a high grade of performance in his teaching is generally recognized. But, in the formulated standards and current practice of many of these agencies, laboratory teaching is improperly represented as of less value than other modes of instruction. . . .

No presentation of science can be truly effective without emphasis upon the way in which scientific knowledge is won and no other manner of emphasizing this phase can be so effective as to see the truth appearing as a result of persistent research. Nothing adds such zest to the search as the knowledge that this truth is new truth or a new aspect of truth that the mind of man has not compassed before. Discrimination against the teacher of a science through under-valuation of his services in the laboratory is unjust to the teacher, unfair to his pupils, and unfavorable to that development in teaching of sciences which the times demand. It is time that scientists should bring this situation to the attention of standardizing agencies and of school and college authorities in positive fashion and should exercise their influence in such ways as may be necessary to remove the handicap under which no small portion of their number are laboring. . . .

It is suggested that those who are concerned investigate the regulations and practices of the organizations which effect them; report pertinent facts through the scientific periodicals; and, through personal influence and the action of groups of scientific men, induce the standardizing agencies to change the discriminatory standards and practices.

M. A. C., *Science*

DEFECTS IN COLLEGE TEACHING.—As a part of the preparation for a course in methods of college teaching, which the writer was scheduled to give during the fall semester 1928-29 at the University of Southern California, a class of fifty-four college students, mostly

seniors and graduates, was asked to contribute as many specific weaknesses, short-comings, defects, faults, and difficulties as they had observed or experienced in connection with college teaching. No list was given the class to be checked lest the responses might be influenced by the suggestions offered. . . . In all there were about three thousand suggestions given.

These reports were classified by the writer according to their types. Obviously, such data do not permit of strictly statistical treatment and, consequently, the present article represents qualitatively but not quantitatively the criticisms of college teaching as offered by the students.

It should be kept in mind that not all college teachers are accused of having all the defects mentioned in this article, since the list is a composite rather than a typical one. The following eighteen points represent the major lines along which criticisms were offered.

1. Defects of personality and temperament. . . .
2. Defects regarding academic freedom, propaganda, and dogmatism. Criticism is made for all degrees of shortcomings, from undue cowardice to extreme radicalism as regards exercise of the right of free speech. . . .
3. Careless and unsatisfactory planning of courses. . . .
4. Lack of study and keeping up with the age. . . .
5. Defects relating to research, writing, and publication. College teachers are criticized both for too little and too much productive work. Some fail to devote time to research and creative work and thus have nothing of their own with which to supplement the books and writings of others. . . . Some are criticized for becoming so engrossed in research that teaching is neglected. Some have the art of writing more highly developed than that of speaking or teaching, and resent the interruption of work on their hobbies necessitated by class meetings. . . .
6. Failure to teach on the student's level. It is reported that college teachers assume more knowledge on the part of the students than they actually possess and fail to start the course upon a sufficiently simple foundation. . . . They assume that the students are all going to be specialists like themselves and they bring out too many of the fine points, technicalities, special cases and exceptions which simply confuse the beginner. . . . They assume that when a student has been told something he has learned it and further repetition is unnecessary. They try graduate methods on freshmen,

and in rare cases make the opposite mistake of trying high-school methods on graduate students.

7. Failure to be practical. . . . College professors are said to lack contact with practical men of affairs and to have too many vicarious experiences and too few real ones. . . . They are said to be unacquainted with what is going on outside of the college, to be uninformed about current events, to lack interest in politics, economics, and industry, and to be so engrossed in their individual specialties as to know little even about other college subjects. They are said to lack a supply of suitable concrete illustrations to give meaning to their well-phrased statements and theories.

8. Failure to develop the research spirit in students. There is said to be too much cramming of knowledge into students, too much memory and too little thought, failure to stimulate intellectual curiosity, awaken enthusiasm, and arouse mental hunger. The teaching fails to create a respect for learning or to inspire a social obligation for solving the world's problems. Teachers are said to do too much of the work and leave too little for the students to do. They fail to teach students how to attack new material and do not give any definite training in the technique of research. They assume that students of the research type will become research workers automatically.

9. Lack of personal interest in students. . . .

10. Failure to make courses interesting. Teachers in college are said to lack interest in their courses sometimes and to be unable to impart their own interest and enthusiasm at other times. . . .

11. Unsatisfactory practices regarding measurement. College teachers are criticized for too much measurement, too little measurement, and the wrong kind of measurement. Some people place so much stress on marks and examinations as to paralyze student effort, others take up time with examinations that should be devoted to instruction. Failure to measure results often enough and failure to vary the type of measurement are reported. . . . Failure to designate the nature of a student's shortcomings or even to hand back papers at all comes in for criticism. . . .

12. Defects regarding the use of the lecture method. College teaching is criticized for too much use of the lecture method as well as ineffective delivery of lectures. . . . Some students also mention the point that there is too little use of the lecture method on the part of teachers who really have something to give and upon

certain types of subject matter which can be handled better by lecture than by discussion.

13. Defects in the use of discussion methods. The discussion method is said to be used by college teachers too little and the art of conversation is poorly developed by them. They are reported to be unable to weld their classes into unified working groups or to create a group consciousness in the class. They do not possess skill in the chairmanship of discussions, and they assume such a prominent part in discussions as to scare the students out. They not uncommonly let some students talk too much, and they lack ability to keep the discussion on the subject. They fail to make definite previous preparation for discussion periods and they rely too much upon starting an argument as a means of killing time when unprepared. . . . Some teachers are criticized for keeping in the background too much during discussions and thus depriving the students of their mature and valuable viewpoints.

14. Lack of variety in teaching procedures. College teachers are said to stick to one method too tenaciously, conducting the class day after day and year after year in exactly the same manner. . . .

15. Failure to adapt the course to the individual student. Ignorance of the character and needs of their students and failure to study the students to find what they are interested in are also faults of college teachers. All students are treated as if they were exactly alike or as if they were all in the class of the very bright. Too little opportunity is granted for students to follow up their own special interests. The student who does not expect to take further courses in the subject is taught in exactly the same way as those who intend to major in it.

16. Improper adjustments of work load. Some teachers are said to overestimate the physical endurance of students and to have no idea of the time required to prepare assignments. They demand so much work that students are tempted to dishonest methods of getting it done, and they drive so hard that students hate the course for sheer overwork. They try to monopolize the student's whole time just as if no other instructors were making assignments. Some teachers are said to pad their courses with large quantities of routine work instead of raising the quality, thus making the courses mere endurance tests. . . .

17. Inefficient routine management. The number of criticisms of college teacher's management of the routine problems of the classroom was not as great as might have been supposed. . . .

18. Lack of faculty cooperation. College teachers are said to fail to get acquainted with each other or to develop institutional loyalty and school spirit as much as they should. Individual teachers do not know what the other departments in the school are doing nor how to cooperate with them. They are frequently unfamiliar with the content of courses given by members of their own department and thus allow too much overlapping of courses and too many unfilled gaps between courses.

C. C. CRAWFORD, University of Southern California,
School and Society

TRAINING COLLEGE TEACHERS.—For purposes of discussion it may be well to consider the relative importance within a college of the centers of emphasis which *do* or *should* shape the activities of a teacher.

These may roughly be described as (1) knowledge of subject matter, (2) methods of instruction, (3) nature of the pupil.

Knowledge of subject matter varies greatly in teachers of college grade. It passes through stages of mere fact acquisition to a period of correlation and interrelation. It may, then, if the teacher is possessed of curiosity and imagination, become a zeal or passion for research.

Methods of instruction may vary from the precise and organized presentation of classified facts by lectures, through discussion of interrelations and principles in a seminar, to the individual contact met with in the search for truth during research work.

With the ordinary range of possibilities in "knowledge of subject matter" and "methods of instruction" we are all fairly familiar. They have been weighed and balanced, contrasted, debated, apportioned, and actually have themselves been made the subject matter of courses of study for prospective teachers. Our knowledge of the nature of the pupil is not, however, nearly as far advanced.

A few years ago I made a tabulation of the courses offered in the schools of education of six of our typical large universities. Approximately 80-85 per cent of their courses dealt with methods of instruction and with administration of educational units. The remaining 15 or 20 per cent were courses in the psychology or other phases of the nature of the pupil.

At that time it appeared to me that the proportional emphasis was entirely erroneous, and I have seen nothing since then to change

that opinion. In fact, the steadily increasing amount of attention which is being given to study and research in mental hygiene, mental tests, child psychology, trait analysis, and similar fields is a very clear indication that our weakness in the sciences underlying the process of education has been recognized.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the differences in individual abilities and potentialities are of great or perhaps of the greatest importance in the wise development of higher education. The frank recognition of this general principle should be one of the factors of most direct influence in shaping our conclusion as to the best procedure of preparing or of selecting college teachers.

The weight of the principle just mentioned is felt in the efforts to include as a part of the prerequisites to a college education certain qualities of character and of "personality" (using that term most generally). It again is expressed in placement examinations, and in honors courses. All such devices are in the nature of a confession that inherent ability is a factor of sufficient importance to warrant its close observation, record and utilization. . . .

The college teacher is also forced to realize that the physical, mental, and moral equipment of the student is likely to be as important a factor in determining final results as are all others together. It therefore becomes his duty to know of what that equipment consists in his various pupils.

Once we have reached this admission certain other things begin to follow naturally. For example, a college teacher should be able to recognize such abilities or disabilities in pupils as trace back to clearly defined physiological or psychological abnormalities which have occurred during the development of the student in question. This would involve at least a speaking acquaintance with human physiology, psychology, and sociology. I rather hope that formal courses in these subjects is not an entirely necessary part of training, for if it is many of our college teachers today would be practically barred from qualification.

In one university, for example, the extent to which these subjects roughly definable as human biology have been studied by faculty members was investigated. Data were obtained from 222 members of the college of liberal arts and eighty-nine of the colleges of technology (engineering). Of the former, eighty-seven per cent had taken one or more courses in the group of subjects in question. Of the latter, only twenty-six per cent were so equipped. The average

number of hours taken by these who had any such courses were twenty-nine and twenty-five, respectively. . . .

Within the college of liberal arts, however, the attitude is not, I think, really very much more human than that of the technical college. If the student finds hard going in economics, he can without great loss of caste move to music or English or some other field, and so on for a far longer period before final disaster than is the case in the college of technology. No great amount of sleep is lost over his peregrinations provided he does work which satisfies the minimum requirements.

Neither of these cases is abnormal or unnatural in any way. The development of the situation as a whole has forced the colleges into their present position.

Perhaps a more important recognition of the lack of interest of college teachers in the inherent nature of their pupils is to be found in the collected opinions of groups of college, high-school, and elementary-school pupils. The college group of comments showed forty-four instructors with "favorable" attitude toward students and seventy without. The high-school group, sixty-two with and eight without, and the elementary group, twenty-nine to two. If these figures are confirmed by later repetition of the experiment, they indicate that there is a decreasing interest in the pupil as one goes higher up the scale. This, if true, is an important argument for placing more emphasis on the analysis of pupils by college teachers. The most advanced product should surely receive most detailed attention or else be subjected to such careful evaluation and classification before coming in contact with college teachers that no effort involving individual analysis would be needed.

It would seem that the university should recognize the need of both such steps. Without better selection and classification of students in the first two years we shall not wisely distribute them for advanced work. This means that universities have a direct and personal interest in developing methods of recognizing and testing ability as far in advance of college age as is possible. These tests should then be continued so as to form an extended and consistent basis for prediction of success in college. College teachers coming in contact with freshmen and sophomores would surely need to have a good working knowledge of all such matters.

On the other hand, college teachers in higher grades of work or in research should not have to consider the fundamental fitness of

their students for work of that grade but should be left free to give their whole time in their own way to directing an already aroused and growing interest in research channels that absorb both their own and the pupil's energies.

Opportunities for training college teachers in human biology are not plentiful. Their almost universal absence is the greatest single weakness of schools of education. Such courses would provide the fundamental and basic research in physiology, psychology, and sociology which is needed before education as an academic profession can become any more impressive in nature than is home economics.

Education as a process is a complex activity involving knowledge and evaluation of subject matter, methods, and last but not least the pupil. Subject matter and methods are changeable and adjustable to various situations—pupils on the other hand even if prodded and poked into some standard form will with great resiliency seek the level dictated by their individual abilities as soon as pressure is released. Educational results to be permanent must always have become a part of the pupil. Overcrowding at our universities has done at least one good turn in forcing on our attention the importance of individual differences. The shift in emphasis in schools of education from highly developed systems of courses on methods and administration to research on human biology seems destined to grow. It would have saved much unnecessary labor and tribulation if it had come earlier. With its development we shall see education not as a simple process capable of standardized and uniform treatment but as a continuous problem in the various levels of which motives must be analyzed, aims defined, and pupils most carefully and extensively studied.

Interest of college teachers in the abilities of the students is the only agent, with the exception of a general salary increase, which seems at present available for giving to university faculties a unity and *esprit de corps* up to now sadly lacking. If the matter is properly nourished, there is a possibility that such geniality and enthusiasms may be developed among faculty members that the "desert" meetings of that austere body "shall rejoice and blossom as the rose."

CLARENCE COOK LITTLE, University of Michigan,

Proceedings, Association of American Universities

COLLEGE CHAPEL, A BRITISH POINT OF VIEW.—. . . That some sort of "religious foundation" is necessary for any really corporate

life and loyalty is a thesis on which I can only touch. But it is from this angle that, as it seems to me, the vexed and (at one time) stormy question of "Religion in the Newer Universities" should be approached. In a word, it is not a case of asking these universities to accord recognition to the churches; it is a case of urging them to face the primary condition of self-realization for themselves.

And here I venture to suggest that nothing short of overt and official recognition, by the university as such, of the place of religion in life will fully meet the case. We have at present all sorts of unofficial or semi-official religious activities, in which many leading members of the universities take even prominent parts, and on which their highest officers publicly smile. . . . But the fact that most of their charters either make no mention of religion, or mention it only to forbid religious tests; the fact that one university explicitly rules out the very possibility of setting up a theological faculty, and so condemns itself to be perpetually incomplete; the fact that while a great deal of building is going on in our colleges and universities, none of it (so far as official enterprise is concerned) has anything to do with the spiritual side of academic life; these are things which, in their suggestive force and inhibiting effect, cannot but outweigh such occasional, or even normal, evidence of unofficial sympathy with religion, even in the highest places.

Apart from the fact that the university as such is doing nothing to make its members religious, this nervousness about the whole subject is only too likely to communicate itself to them. It is already hard enough for the young man and woman of today not to feel subconsciously that there is a divorce between the things of the mind and the things of the spirit, and that, while the former are of ever-increasing importance, the latter are already more like optional if not superfluous extras in the outfit of modern men. This impression is quite adrift from the real under-current of thought, scientific as well as philosophic. . . . But it is easily caught from the surface movements of life. What we cannot afford is to have it reinforced by the official attitude of the newer universities, an attitude (be it remembered) due to the peculiar conditions, philosophical, ecclesiastical, and academic, of the age in which these universities began to be founded, and unwarranted by the altered conditions of today. . . .

So far as the denominational difficulty is concerned, I am sure the newer universities have a real and big contribution to make towards a problem with which the churches have too long been fumbling. . . .

The universities might greatly help, by giving an illustration of "super-denominationalism" in their own expressions of the religious spirit, and so persuading many to identify themselves with religion who, partly just because their own universities seem to stand aloof from it, now regard aloofness on their own part as a duty when it is almost a crime. A real "University Chapel," the official spiritual centre of each of the newer universities, might do an educational work which would be revolutionary and reassuring at once: not replacing, but supplementing the denominational churches of today, and helping to prepare for "the Great Church" of tomorrow.

ARTHUR RIPON, *Universities Review*

COLLEGE CHAPEL, AN AMERICAN POINT OF VIEW.—. . . There are certain rather obvious problems in religion, particularly as they concern the relation of the individual to the institution, which the college student is peculiarly fitted to understand and to help us solve. For this reason his agitation over the question of compulsory chapel has an off-campus, extramural interest for us all. He is here playing over again one of the oldest dramas of history and trying to bring it to a clearer solution. . . .

Wordsworth's reflections in his undergraduate days at Cambridge persuaded him that the chapel services of St. John's College were joyless and lifeless because they represented necessity and nothing more. He concedes to other academic concerns their right to impose discipline—indeed, to regard themselves as "disciplines" pure and simple. He was, first as a student and later as the author of *The Prelude*, unwilling to concede this tacit identification of the spiritual life with discipline alone. . . . He said that life means something more than discipline, and that more is joy; a joy which cannot be attained without discipline, but a joy which at the last knows discipline only as the pleasurable memory of transmuted pain.

The issue still lies just here, where it lay in Wordsworth's day. The apologists for compulsory chapel defend it mainly on the ground that college discipline requires occasional coercive regimentation of the entire community. The arguments are familiar. It is a good thing to get the whole college together regularly; proctors and monitors must be given place and time to make sure that delinquents are not week-ending elsewhere; students need to be taught something about religion no matter if the means is distasteful. A compulsory chapel service, conceived and conducted on this disciplinary

basis, furnishes the best occasion for the realization of these laudable ends.

Now the weakness of the argument rests upon the assumption that what the student needs and is supposed to get in this connection is discipline, not religion. If we may trust the testimony of man after man, long out of college, who endured this coercion, he got the discipline, but it left him with a rooted antipathy to religion and all its works. Those hours of compulsion were unredeemed by any joy, even prophetic, if not actual. In retrospect, many a man admits that on the whole the college was right in teaching him that life means the acceptance of discipline. Meanwhile he goes on into the world laboring under the tragic delusion that religion is discipline and nothing more—a discipline to which he paid the uttermost farthing and of which he is now free. . . .

WILLARD L. SPERRY, Harvard Theological School,
Atlantic Monthly

IN PRAISE OF BIPEDS.—The constitution of the (British) provincial university is fearfully and wonderfully made. I do not know exactly who devised it, probably it is the child of many parents, but I should not think anyone would be specially proud of such an offspring. On the whole it is complicated, and its machinery is apt to creak somewhat in operation. Its designers for some obscure reason thought they could improve upon nature, for they evidently regarded the Siamese twins as a model of convenience in the arrangement of the body. . . .

For in the provincial university the most obvious feature in the constitution is the line which is drawn between the academic and the administrative (including the financial) interests; while academic business (teaching, etc.) is in varying ways and degrees virtually controlled by members of the teaching staff, everything else (and legally the ultimate sovereignty in academic matters too) is almost wholly in the hands of a body composed mainly of outside authorities. Attention is sometimes drawn to the liberality with which business men in great industrial centers have devoted time and labor to the administration of university affairs, and, of course, if the existing system is a good one, our gratitude is due to them. . . .

Most of the universities had small beginnings, and perhaps it was wise to give these academic saplings some outside support, as we support young trees, in the early years of life. Since then they

have grown, and it must be admitted that their constitutions have not entirely stood still. But such alterations as have been made have been mainly in matters of detail, and have not touched the fundamental principles. . . .

A corporate body, such as a university is, requires some form of government, and it may either govern itself or be governed by somebody outside. Most business houses are governed heteronomously (I speak from the point of view of the mass of their employees) and so are most schools. Should a university also be governed on such principles? The older universities of this country, Oxford and Cambridge, are self-governing, and public opinion supports their resolve not to lose their autonomy. Why then, if all are true universities, should these modern ones be different? . . .

Is it true that the purpose of the provincial university differs from that of Oxford and Cambridge in such a manner as to justify autonomy in the one case but not in the other? Surely it will be agreed that the primary function of any university deserving the name must be the advancement of learning, and its dissemination among its students—so far, what is right in one case should be right in the other; the fact that the students in a provincial university are chiefly drawn from the locality does not alter this main principle. We fall back, then, upon the second justification, that of difference in circumstances, and here, I think, we come upon the real heart of the question. The paying of the piper involves a right to control him, and that may be the ultimate reason why the names of eminent citizens, business men, and others adorn the front pages of university calendars.

In some ways it is, no doubt, a relief to the scholar to be free from the anxieties and bothers of administration, but there is something to be said on the other side. Experience shows that a university, to be in a healthy state, must be a genuine corporate body, conscious of its unity, in which each member contributes all he can to the well-being of the whole, and a constitution which admits of any suspicion that some members are as it were employees, controlled but not consulted by a board of directors, is open to objection on the ground that it may breed enmity and schism, and prevent that essential solidarity within the university on which good work depends. This point was well brought out in the Report already mentioned. Perhaps even more pernicious is a system of divisions and distinctions within the academic body itself, such as comes about when the

constitution is a kind of hybrid between autonomy and heteronomy—a state of affairs unhappily not unknown at the present time.

If it is thought good public policy to spend the rate payers' money on a civic university, the university should be trusted to use it properly. Oxford and Cambridge are by no means perfect, but they have had longer experience than we have, and they are in many ways the acknowledged standard of what an English university can be and achieve, and their prestige and success are sufficient evidence that scholars can govern themselves without coming to grief. I do not mean that a civic university should be standoffish and exclusive but it cannot be beyond the wit of man to devise a satisfactory scheme which might afford opportunities for representatives of the ratepayers to make themselves heard and for eminent citizens to take an interest and pride in the university in their midst, and yet might guarantee to the university itself that freedom and responsibility in its own affairs which long experience has shown to be vital.

It may be objected that this would inevitably mean that the academic staff would have to give more time to routine business. Perhaps so, but the price would, I think, be worth paying. . . . Such measures as I have briefly sketched might shock some people, but their attitude is not reasonable. They have simply become so accustomed to think in terms of the Siamese twins that they cannot believe that a university could stand on two legs without tumbling.

Universities Review

LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

AMHERST COLLEGE, SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE TESTS.—Results with a series of tests, including the Alpha, Otis S-A, Terman, three from one set of the American Council on Education, the Smith Information, and the Amherst test, did not indicate that any one of them was especially reliable for predicting scholastic standing. The correlations with college grades were all low, both for freshman year and for the entire course.

None of these tests picked out a lowest four per cent or five per cent for whom one could safely predict scholastic failure, either for freshman year or the entire course. Among men already admitted to college by the current methods the tests did not discover any groups who were incapable of obtaining passing grades.

Considered as tests of scholastic aptitude these tests were faulty in rating relatively low a considerable proportion of the men whose scholastic accomplishment proved to be actually superior.

There was a considerable variability of predictive value of one test repeated with different classes. For freshman grades the correlation of the Otis varied from $.38 \pm .05$ to $.19 \pm .04$; and predictions based on the upper and lower quarters of the test were almost twice as successful for the entire course of one class as for that of another.

The degree of success of the extreme quarters in predicting freshman grades did not reliably indicate the degree of success in predicting final grades.

In spite of the unfavorable facts in our experience, it is still true that the difference between the scholastic performance of men in the low quarter and of men in the high quarter was enough to give nearly all these tests some practical utility.

Some critics think that such tests are discredited when one can show that advice or administrative decisions based on the test scores would be wrong in a considerable percentage of the cases. It is not sufficiently recognized that decisions based in the conventional way on high school grades, entrance examination marks, and personal impressions, are also certainly mistaken in a considerable percentage of the cases. It happens that we know the degree of fallibility of the tests and that we generally ignore the evidence of the great fallibility of the accepted methods. Under such conditions one should welcome the aid of tests, even if no more successful than

the ones we used. But in dealing with an individual one should generally try to get the score translated into a statement of degree of probability of a particular result. There is nothing undesirable in having a student learn how many chances there are against the scholastic success of those in his section of the test scores and how many chances in favor. Perhaps the chief value of studies of such tests in colleges is to furnish more information of this supplementary sort to those who advise high-school students about undertaking a higher education.

CHARLES H. TOLL, Amherst College,
School and Society

BARNARD COLLEGE, ENDOWMENT OF WOMEN'S COLLEGES.—The annual report of Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve describes the effort to obtain a joint endowment being made by the Seven Colleges—Barnard, Bryn Mawr, Mount Holyoke, Radcliffe, Smith, Vassar, and Wellesley. "The mere fact," she says, "that we can cooperate instead of engaging in 'cut-throat' competition, has already surprised and favorably impressed the community, and has attracted considerable attention to the whole problem of higher education of women.

"The most pressing difficulty that the seven colleges face is how to pay adequate salaries to their professors, so that women students may be taught by scholars of as high quality as those who instruct their brothers. Additional endowment for increasing salaries is what we are appealing for definitely and vigorously.

"Possibly no striking results will follow immediately, but we hope, in the long run, for some large donations and especially for bequests in wills. The crisis which has been threatening all seven colleges was suddenly thrust upon Barnard in an acute form this spring, when Columbia University adopted a new salary scale, making material increases in the salaries of all grades for full-time teachers. If Barnard were to continue to maintain its scholarly standing on an equality with the rest of the university, and if the morale of our teaching staff were to be preserved, it was obviously essential for us to follow Columbia's example at once. The trustees met in May, courageously adopted the new schedule, and put it largely into effect for the next year. This great step forward, placing our salaries on a scale which, so far as the writer knows, is higher than any ever before paid at a woman's college, will apparently cause a serious deficit. One million dollars for endowment to increase salaries would solve

this difficulty for us for the moment. From whom can we expect such a gift? What sort of donors will follow the example of our class of 1903 with its nest egg of \$6000 for this good purpose?

"The problem of financing a college for women will probably always be more difficult than that of financing a college for men, because our graduates can contribute but little to our support. Women do not control, and perhaps never will control, much of the money of the world."

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, GRANTS IN AID OF RESEARCH.—In 1917-18 President Wheeler was induced to set aside from the University's budget the sum of two thousand dollars, from which small grants in support of research by individual members of the University Faculty could be made on advice given to the President by a standing committee of the Academic Senate which was established for the purpose and known as the Board of Research. The Board of Research has from the very beginning been composed largely or wholly of men who have themselves contributed in a significant way to the world's knowledge. With the small funds allotted to this purpose at the beginning, the Board of Research could consider informally such requests as were sent to the President of the University for grants for the support of research by individual members of the University Faculty. As year followed year, however, and the success of the plan became more and more evident, larger and larger sums were made available for research. In the present academic year ninety thousand dollars are made available by the President and the Board of Regents for such purposes. A few years ago departmental programs of research, aside from special research institutions to which I will refer below, were also included in the purview of the Board of Research as well as the needs of individual faculty members.

With the large funds now available and the virtual inclusion of most of the research work of the several departments, with such exceptions as I shall point out later, it became necessary to formulate a definite procedure for administering this part of the University's activity. With the experience gained in the earlier years and with the demands of the present day in view we are now working under the following procedure: In February of each year the President of the University sends a circular letter to all members of the Academic Senate, giving each member an opportunity to apply for a grant in

support of his research for the next academic year. Such members of the Academic Senate as have definite programs of study in mind or in the course of investigation and who are not adequately supported in other ways make application for research grants. The applicant is requested to designate the subject which he proposes to investigate and to give a brief statement relative to the objects involved and the general method of attack proposed. He is requested further to state how much money is needed for the support of the project and how the funds are to be used. Such applications, when received by the president of the university, are transmitted to the chairman of the Board of Research, who in due course presents them to the Board for study. In order that deliberate consideration may be given to each of the applications, the Board of Research appoints one or more subcommittees which are requested to report on definite groups of applications, with the subjects of which the subcommittees are most familiar. In cases in which the subcommittee is not fully informed about the achievements of the applicant and the merits or demerits of his proposal, advice is sought from experts within and without the faculty with respect to such applications. When the subcommittee or the subcommittees report to the Board of Research, every application, whether departmental or individual, is considered again by the whole Board, and action is taken. The President of the University is then advised by the Board relative to those projects which the Board approves and those which it disapproves. He is also advised of the necessity of securing funds from outside the research budget of the University in special cases in which there is a large demand for funds for very worthy projects. When the President of the University receives this report he gives it his careful consideration, and if he approves the recommendations of the Board, as he usually does, he writes to inform each successful applicant of the approval of a grant to him and each unsuccessful applicant of the reason or reasons why it is not possible to grant his request.

The support of research in the University in this manner has made possible great accomplishments on a relatively small outlay of funds. A grant of two or three hundred dollars may sometimes aid a professor or instructor to accomplish research of great significance, and this is especially true in the various branches of the humanities. . . .

Other activities of the Board of Research may be briefly stated as follows:

1. The Board of Research advises the administration of the Uni-

versity, with which it is closely coordinated, with respect to new research projects, especially of the larger sort, which it is advisable for the University to undertake. It frequently takes the initiative in calling together a considerable number of faculty members to discuss the advisability of the University's launching an attack upon a new problem which seems pressing for solution. It also advises the administration on ways and means for the support of studies on such a new problem, for example, approaching the large foundations to seek their support. It thus assists, so to speak, in orienting groups of persons from different departments of the University into a co-operative body for outlining and laying before the administration a program of desirable research.

2. The Board of Research again acts in an advisory capacity on such problems as the patent policy of the University, and by thorough discussion in its own body, after advice taken from a number of the most active men in research in the University, the views of the Faculty and of the administration on the subject are clarified and formulated to serve as the guiding policy of the University.

3. The Board of Research advises the President of the University with reference to making grants for traveling expenses for attendance upon meetings of learned societies. . . .

An additional agency in aid of research is the publication service at the University. Since in this day of voluminous publication in all fields there is great pressure upon all journals and other established vehicles for the publication of research, a university press in a large university seems to be an indispensable unit of the university's structure. With this view in mind, the University of California has supported for about a quarter of a century many series of publications in a great variety of fields of learning. There is general faculty supervision of such publications through a standing committee of the Academic Senate coordinate with the Board of Research and known as the Editorial Committee.

CHARLES B. LIPMAN,

Proceedings, Association of American Universities

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHAPTER DISCUSSES PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS.—In September, the 1928 edition of the examination published by the American Council on Education was given to some six hundred students. At the meeting of the Chapter held October 25, Dr. Bean, Professor of Psychology, discussed psychological examina-

tions in general, and more particularly the possible uses to be made of such tests in this University. For many years the complete records of graduates of all approved high schools have been sent to the office of the State Superintendent of Education. These records are now available for study by the professor of secondary education who proposes to use them in connection with the results of the psychological examinations to bring out whatever significant relations can be found. Professor Garrett presented the plan to be used.

McPHERSON COLLEGE, EXPERIMENT IN ITINERANT EDUCATION.—The board of trustees of McPherson College, Kansas, granted the writer a traveling professorship, at the same time authorizing him to select a student group of not to exceed fourteen and to organize them for a year of camping and trekking, while pursuing courses in natural science as follows: field geology, field zoology, and field botany. Credit was to be allowed not to exceed eighteen semester hours, which were to be apportioned among the above-named courses according to the judgment of the instructor at the close of the year's work. The instructor was given a free hand in organizing and arranging all the details relating to mode of travel, plans of work, itinerary, etc.

It was decided that camping should be the mode of living, since this would enable us more easily to reach out-of-the-way places where often our best work could be done. This manner of living also brought the cost of the undertaking within the reach of the average student.

Thirteen students were enrolled from those applying—nine single men, two young ladies, and a man and wife. These were grouped into three companies, each company equipping itself with car, tent, and the other essentials of camp life. . . .

Notes were kept by each student in a notebook especially designed for the trip. A special blank form was filled out for each bird studied, another for each plant, and a third form for animals other than birds. No formal classes were held, but frequent campfire discussions were a part of the program of work.

The keeping of diaries was encouraged. Collections of specimens in geology and other lines were made by most of the students and shipped to their homes from various points.

A small library, consisting of taxonomic works on botany and zoology and a few general works on geology and birds, was carried

by each car. [Between August and March the students explored natural wonders and studied wild life in Colorado, Utah, California, Arizona, Texas, Florida, and Georgia. The last two months were devoted to a study of institutions, museums, libraries, etc., in Washington, New York, Boston, Richmond, and Philadelphia.]

Provided a suitable group can be selected, I have no hesitancy in stating that very much more useful information can be gathered during a year of supervised travel than is furnished by a year in residence in college.

H. H. NININGEK, *School and Society*

OBERLIN COLLEGE, AIMS.—A statement of the aims of the College has been drawn up by the Curriculum Committee as a chart for its own use in the process of revising and modernizing the curriculum. The statement, which has been approved by the Faculty, follows:

"The aims of Oberlin College with reference to its students are:

To train them in the methods of thinking and in the use of the main tools of thought;

To acquaint them with the main fields of human interest and to direct them in the acquisition of knowledge therein;

To guide them in the integration of knowledge;

To afford them intensive training, and to encourage creative activity, within a chosen field;

To prepare them for further study or (within certain limits) for occupation after college;

To establish in them the habit of continuous scholarly growth;

To develop their power to enjoy, and to create, the beautiful;

To develop their physical and mental health;

To develop their social resourcefulness;

To develop their moral and religious life;

To prepare them for intelligent, effective, and loyal participation in the life of family, community, nation, and the international order."

In commenting upon this statement President Wilkins says: "Both Committee and Faculty regard it rather as a working chart than as a definitive formulation. It is, therefore, subject to revision and is published in the hope that it may suggest constructive criticism, which, whether private or public, will be welcomed and may be utilized in the actual process of curriculum building, which is now under way.

"It is not claimed that Oberlin at the present time makes an ade-

quate effort to achieve all these aims: they represent a program belonging to the immediate future.

"It is not claimed or thought that the statement is strikingly new. It has, however, been worked over again and again, through several hours of interesting debate, and is believed to be a sound and more than ordinarily complete and thoughtful statement.

"We hope to attack the problem of training in thinking through direct practice in the field of logic as well as through the indirect practice to be had in all courses. By the main tools of thought we mean, in particular, English (written and oral), foreign language, mathematics, and bibliography.

"We hope so to plan each student's individual curriculum that it may in its generalizing phase include the gaining of a significant measure of ordered knowledge in each of several typically different fields.

"The task of integration may be attempted in various ways: in part, very possibly—but not necessarily—by orientation courses.

"Within the field of specialization we shall most heartily encourage a type of individual scholarly experimentation or investigation which may properly be called creative.

"We send so high a proportion of our graduates into graduate or professional schools that specific preparation for this experience forms a part of our task. Our vocational preparation is limited to the fields of teaching and physical education."

PARK COLLEGE, HONORS WORK.—In the spring of 1927, Park College adopted a plan of honors work for gifted students. Its adoption was due to a growing conviction on the part of the administrative officers and teachers of the college that the college, through its routine channels, did not offer sufficient encouragement and assistance to students in the upper division of the college. Park College is a liberal arts college with an approximate enrolment of five hundred. The college makes use of a selective admission plan, and is not confined to a local constituency, more than fifty per cent of its students come from outside the state of Missouri. . . .

For the first year, 1927-28, honors work was limited to members of the senior class. Ten per cent of the membership of this class was approved by the faculty committee for this type of work. The following departments were represented: biology, chemistry, education, English, French, physics, Spanish, sociology. The student

approved was released from the routine requirements of the college, tests, class attendance, and examinations, and was assigned to the department concerned for an individual program. In order to secure unity of procedure and a discussion of common problems a meeting of all students and teachers supervising honors work was held once every month. At this meeting two or three papers were presented by honors students, followed by a general discussion. At each meeting some visitor was present, usually from one of the neighboring universities, who participated in the discussion or delivered an informal address on some topic of interest to the group. These meetings were held at the homes of the members of the faculty...

At the end of the year a comprehensive examination was given. The oral examinations were conducted by outside examiners, with one exception, from the two universities, Kansas and Missouri. Members of the teaching staff and students approved for honors work the following year were invited to be present, others by special invitation.

W. F. SANDERS, *School and Society*

PEMBROKE COLLEGE, CHANGE OF NAME.—The Corporation of Brown University has passed the following vote and adopted the appended statement:

"Voted: That in recognition of the growth of the Women's College and in order to give it a more distinctive name and place in American education, it shall henceforth be known as Pembroke College in Brown University.

"In making this change of name, which has long been desired by many of the best friends of the Women's College, the Corporation wish to place on record their deep satisfaction in the growth and achievements of this division of the University. We recognize the Women's College as an integral part of the University, not only at the present time but through the expanding future. So long as we offer the higher education to men, so long we expect to offer it also to women. Under the new name the old policy will continue and Pembroke College in Brown University will be one of the chief objects of our interest and care."

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, VARIED CHAPEL SERVICES.—The Dean of the University Chapel has announced a plan for the daily voluntary chapel service which is to be held in a fifteen-minute period

between the first and second morning lectures. "We shall have," he says, "not one type of chapel service but several different types, each recurring each week on a fixed day. Thus one can go to the chapel for the particular kind of practice that he likes and avoid the sort that he does not need." Organ recitals by the choirmaster will constitute the service on Wednesday and Friday. On Tuesday there will be morning prayers with the participants using a responsive service. On Thursday the Dean of the Chapel or some member of the Faculty will give a short address. No formal service will be held on Monday but singing will be the chief feature, to encourage the learning of the chorales which are to become a part of the Sunday service. The daily attendance this fall has averaged one hundred and fifty, four times what it was last year.

RADCLIFFE COLLEGE, TUTORIAL HOUSE.—A Tutorial House has just been opened with eleven rooms each furnished to provide an harmonious background for the subject to be discussed there. Radcliffe students work with Harvard tutors under the Harvard tutorial system. Conferences in English Literatures will be carried on in the Queen Anne Room; those in American Literature in the Early New England Room; those in American History in the Federal Virginia Room. There is a Pompeian Room for the classics, an Oriental Room for Far Eastern history, a Spanish Room, a German Room, a Louis XIV Room, a Dutch Room for economics and government, a Medieval Room for philosophy, and a Modernistic Room for Mathematics. Sciences conferences are carried on in the university laboratories.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, PH.D.'S IN INDUSTRY.—Before the war most of the chemists who received the degree of doctor of philosophy at the University became teachers; at present the majority are in industry. The Department of Chemistry has recently compiled some interesting figures. From 1899, when the first Ph.D. in the department was graduated, to 1919, only eight persons with the degree had gone into industrial work. Fifty-six of the one hundred nine who have received the degree since 1919 are in industrial work. One hundred forty-seven doctor's degrees in all have been granted to students in the department. Of these fifty-eight are teaching; fifty-four are in research and administrative work in industries; nine are manufacturing executives; nine are doing govern-

ment research; and eight are doing research in universities. Others are in municipal research laboratories and other activities.

UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING, CHAPTER PROGRAM.—Some controversial topic in education will be considered at each of the monthly Chapter meetings. The address, sometimes by a member of the Chapter, sometimes by a visitor or a member of the University administration, will be followed by general organized discussion. November, The Junior College, Dr. A. G. Crane; December, Dr. Meiklejohn's Experimental College, Miss Margaret Scallon, Department of English, University of Wisconsin; January, The Anti-Evolution Movement in American Education, Dr. Aven Nelson; February, What Should Be the Content of the Liberal Arts Course? Dean J. F. Soule; March, Keeping Up the Standards, Registrar R. E. McWhinnie; April, Current Criticism of American Universities, Professor O. H. Rechard; May, Student Health, the University Nurse.

MEMBERSHIP

MEMBERS ELECTED

The Committee on Admissions announces the election of ninety-two members as follows:

Antioch College, Joseph Bartlett, Irving Cannon, R. F. Eastman, D. S. Hanchett, Lucy G. Morgan, C. A. Nosker, Imogene H. Putnam, Julia E. Turner; **Bates College**, G. M. Chase; **Bethany College**, H. T. McKinney; **University of Buffalo**, Katherine S. Holmes; **Grinnell College**, L. C. Douglas, Wayne Gard, W. H. Mack; **Hamline University**, A. B. Potorf; **Heidelberg College**, K. B. Barnes; **Hood College**, Frances E. Baldwin; **Hunter College**, F. P. Gutekunst; **Iowa State College**, J. C. Eldredge, A. H. Fuller, M. R. Good, H. M. Hamlin, Barton Morgan, G. M. Pratt, Marie Stephens, Marcia Turner; **Johns Hopkins University**, C. R. Austrian, F. H. Baetjer, G. H. Bailey, C. F. DeGaris, L. J. Goldbach, L. P. Hamburger, James Hart, W. J. Huff, L. W. Miles, A. T. Mussen, Esther L. Richards, J. T. Singewald, Jr., D. E. Weglein, W. H. Wilmer, Samuel Wolman; **Lehigh University**, A. H. Fretz; **University of Maryland**, E. S. Johnston; **Massachusetts Institute of Technology**, C. M. Spofford; **Mills College**, Matilde Ellies; **College of the City of New York**, A. D. Tendler; **Occidental College**, Ethel Taylor; **University of Oregon**, H. R. Taylor; **University of Pittsburgh**, Elmer Hutchinson, O. L. Reiser, G. D. Whitney, A. G. Worthing; **Princeton University**, Albert Elsasser; **University of Redlands**, Ashel Cunningham, S. W. Cummings, G. A. Harris, L. D. Osborn, Lois J. Rankin, W. H. Roberts, W. T. Shaw; **Rockford College**, R. D. Mullinix; **Rutgers University**, Richard Morris; **Rollins College**, L. H. Jenks, J. C. Th. Uphof, E. F. Weinberg; **Rosary College**, Mary E. O'Hanlon; **Skidmore College**, C. B. Cheney, J. R. Hobbie; **Smith College**, R. F. Donovan; **University of South Dakota**, E. P. Churchill; **Temple University**, H. F. Bernhardt; **Vassar College**, Josephine Gleason, Helen D. Lockwood, P. A. Northrop, Irene C. Ringwood, H. C. Tingey, Caroline F. Ware; **Washburn College**, B. W. Maxwell; **Washington State College**, L. J. Smith; **Williams College**, C. L. Graham; **University of Wisconsin**, Lelia Bascom, G. S. Bryan, P. M. Buck, Jr., H. C. Berkowitz, R. R. Huestis; **Yale University**, S. W. Dudley, K. R. Greenfield, E. H. Lockwood, M. A. May, D. E. Owen, N. J. Spykman, W. R. Vance.

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following one hundred and thirty-two nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions¹ and will be considered by the Committee if received before January 10, 1929.

The Committee on Admissions consists of Frederick Slocum, Wesleyan, *Chairman*; W. C. Allee, Chicago; A. L. Bouton, New York; E. S. Brightman, Boston; E. C. Hinsdale, Mt. Holyoke; A. L. Keith, South Dakota; A. O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins; W. T. Magruder, Ohio State; F. A. Saunders, Harvard.

James F. Adams (Agriculture), Delaware
Ruth Margaret Agnew (English), Smith
Ann Fuller Anderson (Biology), Georgia State (Women)
Eudsfilia Arboleda (Spanish), Goucher
George L. Baker (Chemistry), Delaware
James A. Barkley (History and Political Science), Delaware
William D. Baskett (Modern Languages), Central
Robert M. Bear (Education), Centre
Harold H. Blanchard (English), Tufts
W. R. Bond (Physiology), Virginia Medical
R. W. Bost (Chemistry), North Carolina
J. Coy Bour (Law), Missouri
George H. Brandes (Chemistry), Muhlenberg
Minnie M. Brashear (English), Missouri
Roberta Florence Brinkley (English), Goucher
Jean Ingram Brooks (History), Goucher
Edwin Colby Byam (Modern Languages), Delaware
Jefferson C. Bynum (Geology), North Carolina
Gordon F. Cadisch (Economics), Maryland
George T. Caldwell (Biology), Arizona
Frank Kenneth Cameron (Chemistry), North Carolina
W. W. Carpenter (Education), Missouri
B. F. Chappelle (Modern Languages), Nevada
Charles B. Clark (Education), Hillsdale
Lloyd Loring Click (English), Texas
H. Philip Constans (English), Wyoming

¹ Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, 222 Charles River Road, Cambridge, Mass.

Arthur G. Coons (Economics), Occidental
John Linton Coyle (Mechanical Engineering), Delaware
Esther Crane (Education), Goucher
Harry P. C. Cressman (Sociology), Muhlenberg
Horace Downs Crockford (Chemistry), North Carolina
F. M. Darnall (English), Central
Anita DeOyarzabal (Spanish), Goucher
Bruce M. Donaldson (Fine Arts), Michigan
M. M. Dougherty (Economics), Delaware
Charles A. Drake (Psychology), Adelphi
W. G. Dunning (Chemistry), Temple
William H. Edwards (Political Science), Sweet Briar
Ohmer H. Engle (Biology), Mount Union
James W. Errant (Government), Oklahoma
David Owen Evans (Modern Languages), Delaware
Robert Ryland Fleet (Mathematics), Central
J. C. Forbes (Chemistry), Virginia Medical
Joseph F. Francis (Law), Oklahoma
Robert R. Fritsch (English Bible), Muhlenberg
G. M. Gilligan (Chemistry), Delaware
Wilbur E. Gilman (English), Missouri
Justin L. Glathart (Physics), Williams
G. F. Gray (Horticulture), Delaware
Ellwood Griscom, Jr. (Public Speaking), Texas
W. E. Gwatkin, Jr. (Latin), Missouri
Thomas Hoffman Hamilton (Music), Muskingum
Clair A. Hannum (Biology), Arizona
Mildred Fish Harnack (English), Goucher
Marian Harrington (Physical Education), Seton Hill
Henry C. Harris (Agronomy), Delaware
Thomas Perrin Harrison (English), North Carolina State
Leonard Haseman (Entomology), Missouri
C. C. Haskell (Physiology), Virginia Medical
E. S. Hathaway (Zoology), Tulane
Louise R. Heath (Philosophy), Hood
Henry Rudolf Henze (Chemistry), Texas
W. B. Hesseltine (History), Chattanooga
Sara M. Holbrook (Education), Vermont
Frederick J. Holl (Biology), Buffalo
E. B. Hungerford (English), Northwestern

Albert H. Imlah (History), Tufts
Franklin P. Johnson (Greek), Duke
Ralph W. Jones (Mathematics), Delaware
Dorothy Kaucher (English), Missouri
J. C. Keller (Chemistry), Muhlenberg
W. B. Kerr (History), Buffalo
Ernestine A. Kinney (Education), Occidental
David Ballin Klein (Psychology), Texas
Hugo MacMillan Kressin (Spanish), Georgia State (Women)
Leonard P. Kurtz (Romance Languages), Buffalo
Margaret Landwehr (German), Hillsdale
J. W. Richard Lindemann (English), Buffalo
Edward J. Lorenz (Physics), Toledo
Joseph A. Luyckx (Commerce), Detroit
Robert F. McCracken (Chemistry), Virginia Medical
Caroline E. MacGill (English), St. Teresa
Kenneth V. Manning (Physics), Williams
Anna E. Miller (Physical Education), Georgia State (Women)
E. C. L. Miller (Bacteriology), Virginia Medical
Morton E. Mix (English), Hillsdale
Helen K. Mull (Philosophy), Sweet Briar
P. B. Myers (Chemistry), Delaware
Sidney S. Negus (Chemistry), Virginia Medical
Ernest W. Nelson (History), Duke
Lena M. Niles (Physical Education), Carleton
Raymond Oosting (Physical Training), Trinity
Hjalmer L. Osterud (Anatomy), Virginia Medical
Elinor Pancoast (Economics), Goucher
Harold Dawes Parcell (Romance Languages), Wesleyan
J. L. Parks (Law), Missouri
Carl L. Pawlowski (Music), Oklahoma
Lowell J. Ragatz (History), George Washington
Donovan Rhynsbarger (English), Missouri
Naomi Riches (History), Goucher
Donald E. Richmond (Mathematics), Williams
Windsor H. Roberts (History), Hillsdale
Florence H. Robinson (Latin), Sweet Briar
Mabel T. Rogers (Physics), Georgia State (Women)
Charles J. Rowland (Economics), Pennsylvania State
Alfred C. Schlesinger (Latin), Williams

L. G. H. Adolph Schumacher (Latin), Toledo
 George L. Schuster (Agronomy), Delaware
 Clair K. Searles (Economics), Toledo
 Louise C. Seibert (Romance Languages), Goucher
 John V. Shankweiler (Biology), Muhlenberg
 Robert Boies Sharpe (English), Goucher
 Frederick W. Shaw (Bacteriology), Virginia Medical
 Evald L. Skau (Chemistry), Trinity
 Glenn S. Skinner (Chemistry), Delaware
 Clark H. Slover (English), Texas
 Sterling B. Smith (Chemistry), Trinity
 L. J. Stadler (Agriculture), Missouri
 James Reid Sterrett, Jr. (English), Centre
 Augustus Trowbridge (Physics), Princeton
 Gray Truitt (Sociology), Adelphi
 Margaret E. Tuttle (Home Economics), Georgia State (Women)
 Arthur P. R. Wadlund (Physics), Trinity
 Harry O. Warner (Electrical Engineering), Detroit
 Mary D. Weber (Physics), Goucher
 Carleton A. Wheeler (Romance Languages), Tufts
 H. F. White (Economics), Georgia State (Women)
 Arthur S. Wiley (Romance Languages), Occidental
 Pauline Williams (Pathology), Virginia Medical
 Clinton Ivan Winslow (Political Science), Goucher
 J. B. Winslow (Mathematics), Toledo
 W. C. Witham (Chemical Engineering), Delaware

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST (29)

John C. S. Andrew (History), Boston
 Harold T. Barr (Engineering), Arkansas
 Charles B. Bowman (Economics), Muhlenberg
 Delzie Demaree (Botany), Arkansas
 George T. Ettinger (Latin), Muhlenberg
 George K. Foresman (Chemistry), Purdue
 Helen Graham (Education), Arkansas
 George M. Gregory (English), Duke
 Charles C. Hatley (Physics), Duke
 Keith L. Holloway (Agriculture), Arkansas
 Holland Holton (Education), Duke
 Glenn E. Hoover (Economics), Mills

Lewis H. Leech (Journalism), Northwestern
Oneta Liter (Home Economics), Louisville
James F. McCrew (Public Speech), Arkansas
Elgar Martin (Animal Husbandry), Arkansas
S. W. Ploger (Geology), Syracuse
Davis P. Richardson (Mathematics), Arkansas
J. W. Sappenfield (Physics), Louisville
A. C. Silverman (Medicine), Syracuse
Hallie C. Smith (English), Georgia State (Women)
Harry P. Smith (Education), Syracuse
Frederick E. Steinhausen (Roman Languages), Duke
V. O. Tansey (Geology), Arkansas
Ernest Thelin (Psychology), Syracuse
H. M. Tilroe (Speech), Syracuse
John L. Waller (History), Oklahoma
Frederick E. Wilson (German), Duke
Marion Witt (English), Arkansas

BULLETIN
OF
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Index
JANUARY-DECEMBER, 1928
(Volume XIV)

THE JOURNAL OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF THE HISTORY OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

INDEX TO THE BULLETIN, VOLUME XIV, 1928¹

A

Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, *W. W. Boyd*, 5 328

Academic Freedom and Tenure. Committee A—Report, 1927, *A. M. Kidd*, Chm., 2 102; Statements, South Dakota State College, 8 572; West Chester Normal School, 5 401

Admission to Higher Schools, Colleges and Universities? Are too Many Seeking—, *W. C. Ryan*, 5 384

Admission of Students, Selective—, *Carnegie*, 6 459

Admissions Methods, *Vassar*, 2 153

Admissions and Personnel, *Brown*, 2 147

Adult Education, An Experiment in—, Cleveland College, *A. C. Ellis*, 5 371

Alumni Reading List, *Pittsburgh*, 7 558; *Wesleyan*, 4, 294

American Council of Learned Societies, Directory, 6 415; Grants for Research, 8 568

American and German University, *C. F. Thwing*, 5 321, 387

American Historical Association and Mayor of Chicago, *Resolution*, 2 134

American History, Teaching in England, 6 419

American Universities and Colleges, *D. A. Robertson* (BR), 5 318

Amherst, Scholastic Aptitude Tests, 8 612

Angell, J. R. (Yale), The Endowed Institution and Public Education, 6 540

Annual Meeting.—1927, Cincinnati, 2 92; *Resolutions*: Resignation from Instructing Staff (92); Election of Officers (93); Organization and Conduct of Chapters, Methods of Appointment and Promotion (95); Academic Freedom and Tenure (102); Economic Condition of the Profession and Income Tax Questions (106); Latin American Universities (108); International Institute of Teachers College (110); Annual Meeting for 1928, 5 302; 6 412; Preliminary Program, 7 492

Annuities, *Minnesota*, 2 150

Appointment and Promotion, Committee B.—*Hardin Craig*, Chm., Resolution, 2 92; Report (95)

Appointment Service, 8 568

Arnett, T., Cooperation of Trust Companies with Colleges and Universities, 5 324

Art Course, Cooperative—, *Reed*, 7 559

Art Instruction in Colleges and Universities, *Holmes Smith*, 4 246

Association of American Colleges, 2 132

Association of American Universities, 6 413

Association of Governing Boards of State Universities.—Province of Governing Boards, *S. D. Brooks*, 5 354; Quality of Teaching, *D. W. Springer*, 357

Association of University and College Business Officers of the Eastern States, 4 236

Association of University Teachers (British), Entrance Requirements, 6 416; Membership (417); Cost of Living (418)

Athletes, Student—, *H. W. Chase*, 5 389

B

Batchelder, N. H. The Rising Tide of College Graduates, 7 522

Beck, F. T. (Bucknell), Preparing the College Graduate for High School Teaching, 7 511

Bennington College, 3 220; Faculty-Student Relationship, 7 555

Bibliography—Practical, Enumerative, Historical, *H. B. Van Hoesen* (BR), 7 503

Bipeds, In Praise of—, 8 609

Bookstore, University—, *Ohio State*, 6 473

Botanical Education in America, *C. S. Gager*, 4 274

Boyd, W. W. (Western College), Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, 5 328

Briggs, Lucia R. (Milwaukee-Downer), Students and the Administration, 5 323

British Debaters in America, 8 570

British Degrees for Americans, *R. M. Wenley*, 4 251

British Universities Review, 8 571

Burton, Ernest DeWitt, A Biographical Sketch, *T. W. Goodspeed* (BR), 6 423

¹ Monthly numbers in Italics, pages in Roman, i. e., 2 54; (BR) indicates Book Review

Business as a Profession, *N. M. Butler*, 5 381

Butler, *N. M.* (Columbia), Teaching the Sciences, 3 201; Freedom of Speech, 4 270; Business as a Profession, 5 381

C

California, Grants in Aid of Research, 8 614

Carnegie Corporation, *F. P. Keppel*, 3 173

Chapel, Dean of—, *Princeton*, 5 399; —Services, 8 620

Chapters, Organization and Conduct of Local—, Committee E, *Edward S. Allen*, Chm., Report 2 93

Chase, *H. W.* (North Carolina), Student Athletes, 5 389

Chemical Education, College Libraries—, *P. L. K. Gross*, 3 197

China Institute in America, 3 174

Cité Universitaire, 7 498

Coats, *Marion*, New Type of College, 5 365

Coffman, *L. D.* (Minnesota), Freedom in State Universities, 6 441

College.—American—and Its Rulers, *J. E. Kirkpatrick*, 2 124; Aims of a Liberal—, *A. S. Pease*, 2 135; The Changing—, *E. H. Wilkins* (BR), 4 259; British View—Chapel, 8 606; American View—Chapel, *W. S. Sperry*, 8 608; —Debating, *R. Withington*, 7 550; Cost of—Education, *F. W. Reeves*, 5 326; Problems of—Education (BR), *Earl Hudelson*, 7 501; The Effective—, *R. L. Kelly* (BR), 7 504; Experimental—, *Wisconsin*, 5 400; —Entrance Examination Board, 2 132; English Village—, 4 240; —of Engineering, *Southern California*, 5 400; —after Fifty Years, 4 285; —and Graduate School (R), *A. L. Lowell*, 3 182; How to Study in—, *L. A. Headley*, 5 322; Scientific Improvement of—Instruction, *M. E. Haggerty*, 4 281; —Libraries and Chemical Education, *P. L. K. Gross*, 3 197; New Type of—, *Marion Coats*, 5 365; —Personnel Technique, *A. L. Jones*, 5 338; Save the Old-Fashioned—, *D. J. Cowling*, 7 534; School and—, *J. A. Lester*, 7 507; —for the Serious, *H. A. Larrabee*, 3 215; —Student's Objective, *W. H. P. Faunce*, 3 211; Predicting—Success of High School Senior, *J. B. Johnston* (R), 3 192; What Does

a—Teacher Do? *Educational Record*, 7 524; National Society of—Teachers of Education, 2 132; Enlistment and Training of—Teachers, *O. E. Randall*, 4 276; 5 329; —and University Library Problems, *G. A. Works* (BR), 3 181; Teaching—Women to Read, *J. H. T. Main*, 4 272; Which—? *Rita S. Halle* (BR), 8 577

Colleges and Business, *E. M. Hains*, 3 194

Colleges, Endowment of Women's—, 8 613

Colleges, Question of the Women's—, 2 144

Colleges, Relation of Secondary Schools to—, *A. L. Lowell*, 5 384

Colleges, Tolerance and the—, *J. C. Miller*, 6 446

Colleges and Universities, Cooperation of Trust Companies with—, *T. Arnett*, 5 324

Columbus—Undergraduate, *J. A. Benn* (BR), 6 427

Committees for 1928, 1 75

Compton, *K. T.* (Princeton), Specialization and Cooperation in Scientific Research, 3 203

Connecticut College, Resignation of President, 6 464

Constitution and By-Laws, 1 5; Amendments, 6 412

Copyright.—Revision, Congressional Digest, 1927 (R), 3 176; Legislation, 5 312

Corporation Schools, *R. S. Uhrbrock*, 3 213

Council of A. A. U. P.—Business and Report, 2 119; Membership; Freedom of Teaching in Science; Association of American Colleges; Teaching Load; Annual Meeting; Academic Freedom and Tenure, Committee Chairmen

Cowling *D. J.* (Carleton), Save the Old-Fashioned College, 7 534

Crew, *Henry* (Northwestern), New President's Message, 3 167

Curricular Gaps, *W. C. Ruediger*, 5 358

Curriculum.—Changes, *City of New York*, 6 471; New—, 4 293; College—for Women, *Meta Glass*, 4 271

Curtis-Reed Bill, 5 383

D

Dean, What Does a—Do? *H. F. Stone*, 7 526

Democracy and Scholarship, *Paul Shorey*, 3 190
 Dictionary on Historical Principles, A New English—(BR), 6 432
 Dictionary of Ideas, *Chicago*, 4 287
 Doctors of Philosophy, *Chicago*, 2 149
 Downey, Mary E. (Denison), Library Courses in College, 7 538

E

Economic Condition of the Profession and Income Tax Questions, Committee Z, *J. H. Hollander*, Chm., Report, 2 106

Education.—Creative—in School, College, University, and Museum, *H. F. Osborn* (BR), 2 130; —that Educates, *J. M. Manly*, 4 266; Experiment in Itinerant—, *McPherson College*, 8 617; Higher—, *A. J. Klein*, 2 126; The Endowed Institution and Public—, *J. R. Angell*, 6 540; Report of U. S. Commissioner of—, 4 241; Southern Conference on—, 8 569; The Value of a Liberal—, *Daniel Evans*, 4 279

Educational Conference, *Ohio State*, 3 223

Educational Credo, *H. McN. Poleat*, 7 512

Educational Foundation, *C. R. B.*—, 7 499

Educational Standards, Securing National—, *C. R. Mann*, 7 517

Educational Surveys, Higher—, *U. S. Bureau of Education*, 7 497

Ellis, A. C. (Cleveland College), An Experiment in Adult Education, 5 371

Engineer, The—, *R. L. Sackett* (BR), 8 576

Engineering and Commerce, *Akron*, 6 457

Engineering, Modern Languages and—, 7 530

Engineering Teachers, Summer School for—, 5 302

Evans, Daniel (Andover), The Value of a Liberal Education, 4 279

Examinations, As for—, *E. P. Kimball*, 7 552

Experimental College, *Wisconsin*, 6 479

F

Facing Life, *W. H. P. Faunce* (BR), 8 576

Faculty, New Plan of College—, *Johns Hopkins*, 3 223

Faculty-Student Relationship, *Bennington College*, 7 555

Faunce, W. H. P. (Brown), College Student's Objective, 3 211; Facing Life (BR), 8 576

Fife, R. H. (Columbia), Modern Foreign Language Study, 3 184

Film Foundation, *Harvard*, 5 396

Foreign Language Requirements for Ph.D., *E. C. Hills*, 3 186

Foreign Language Study, Modern—, *R. H. Fife*, 3 184

Foreign Students, Guide Books for—, 5 309

Freedom of Speech, *N. M. Butler*, 4 270; In Wisconsin, 4 270

Freshmen.—Contact Officer for Prospective—, 5 377; —Week, *Ohio State*, 4 291; Importance of—Year, *P. T. Walden*, 4 284

G

Gager, C. S. Botanical Education in America, 4 274

Gauss, Christian (Princeton), The Comedy of Leadership, 6 435

General Education Board, Annual Report, 6 415

Geology, Summer Course in European—, *Harvard*, 6 466

Gifford, W. S. Does Business Want Scholars? 7 547

Gilson, Etienne (Harvard), The Ethics of Higher Studies, 3 209

Glass, Meta (Sweet Briar), College Curriculum for Women, 4 271

Government, School of—, *George Washington*, 2 149

Graduate Work, What is—? *D. A. Robertson*, 8 592

Gross, P. L. F. (Pomona), College Libraries and Chemical Education, 3 197

H

Haggerty, M. E. (Minnesota), Scientific Improvement of College Instruction, 4 281; Occupational Destination of Ph.D. Recipients, 7 494; Teaching and the Ph.D., 8 584

Hawkes, H. E. (Columbia), Three Types of Students, 7 556

Health Advisers, *Smith*, 6 478

Henry, R. P. (Miami), Summer Schools, An Adverse Idea, 3 217

High School and the College, Better Adjustment between the—, *R. L. Kelly*, 5 342

Higher Studies, Ethics of—, *E. Gilson*, 3 209

Hills, E. C. (California), Foreign Language Requirements for Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, 3 186

Historical Principles, A New English Dictionary on—(BR), 6 432

Hollander, J. H. (Johns Hopkins), Income Tax, 4 245

Home Economics Courses as a Means of General Education, *Agnes F. Morgan*, 3 212

Honor Business, This—, *New Student*, 3 216

Honors Courses, Law, *Yale*, 3 227

Honors in English, Reading for—, *Bucknell*, 3 220

Honors Work, *Park*, 8 619

Hopkins, E. M. (Dartmouth), Colleges and Business, 3 194

"Humanics," *W. E. Nickerson*, 5 379

Hutchinson, Emilie J. (Barnard), Women and the Ph.D., 5 87

I

Immigration of College Professors, 7 498

Income Tax Questions, 2 106; 4 245

Institute of International Education, 4 240; 5 306

Insurance (see *Pensions*)

International Bureau of Education, 4 239

International Conferences, 4 237

International Finance Institute, 5 305

International Institute of Teachers College, *Paul Monroe*, 2 110

International Studies, Geneva School of—, 2 134

Iowa, State Meeting of the A. A. U. P. at Grinnell College, 6 466

Italian Professors, Visiting—, 4 240

J

Japanese Universities, 6 419

Johnston, J. B. (Minnesota), Predicting College Success for the High School Senior, 3 182

Jones, A. L. (Columbia), College Personnel Technique, 5 338

Junior College.—California, *R. L. Wilbur*, 5 362; *Columbia*, 4 287

Junior Year Abroad, 5 307

K

Kelly, R. L., Better Adjustment between High School and College, 5 342; The Effective College (BR), 7 504

Keppel, F. P. (Carnegie Corporation), Annual Report, 3 173

Kimball, E. P. (Smith), As for Examinations, 7 552

Kirkpatrick, J. E., American College and Its Rulers (BR), 2 124

Klein, A. J. Higher Education (BR), 2 126

L

Laing, G. J. (Chicago), The Function of the University, 5 348

Land Grant College Survey, 5 303

Landis, B. Y. (Columbia), Professional Code (BR), 2 129

Latin-American Universities, Cooperation with—, Committee L, *L. S. Rowe*, Chm., 2 108

Law School, Admission to the—, *Columbia*, 6 463

Leadership, The Comedy of—, *Christian Gauss*, 6 435

Learning, High Cost of—, 7 541

Lester, J. A. (Harvard), School and College, 7 507

Lewis, W. M. (Lafayette), Teaching Teachers, 2 141

Liberties, Our Ancient (BR), 4 261

Liberty, Civil—, *E. M. Phelps* (BR), 4 261

Library Courses in the College, *Mary E. Downey*, 7 538

Library School, Graduate—, *Chicago*, 6 460

Linguistic Institute, *Yale*, 3 227; 7 497

Literature and Science, *Chicago*, 2 147

Little, C. C. (Michigan), Training College Teachers, 8 603

Logic and Persuasion, *E. H. Paget*, 8 582

Louisville, University of—, Local Situation, 5 398

Lowell, A. L. (Harvard), College and Graduate School (R), 3 182; Master of Arts Degree, 4 280; Relation of Secondary Schools to Colleges, 5 384

Lowes, J. L. (Harvard), Road to Xanadu (BR), 3 183

M

- McDonald, P. B.** (New York University), Research and Other Intellectual Activities, 7 528
Main, J. H. T. (Grinnell), Teaching College Women to Read, 4 272
Man of Learning, N. A. Crawford (BR), 6 423
Manly, J. M. (Chicago), Education that Educates, 4 266
Mann, C. R. (American Council on Education), Securing National Educational Standards, 7 517
Mayer, Joseph (Tufts) (see *Treasurer*)
Master of Arts Degree, A. L. Lowell, 4 280
Medical Curriculum, Alternation of—, Johns Hopkins, 4 288; *Yale*, 294
Medical Education, W. C. Rappleye, 3 169
Medical Education, Annual Congress on—, 5 309
Members, List of—, 1 10
Metcalf, M. M. (Johns Hopkins), Research in Colleges, 4 277
Military and Civilian Drill, College of City of New York, 6 472
Miller, J. C. (Pennsylvania), Tolerance and the Colleges, 6 446
Missouri Wesleyan College, Merger with Baker University, 6 471
Modern Languages and Engineering, 7 520
Monroe, Paul (Columbia), International Institute of Teachers College, 2 110
Morgan, Agnes F. (California), Home Economics Courses as a Means of General Education, 3 212

N

- National Education Association**, 4 241
National Educational Conference, 2 132
National Research Council, 3 174; 4 236
National Student Federation of America, The Open Road, 6 421
Nature Almanac (R), 4 264
Nature of the World and of Man (BR), 3 176

O

- Oberlin, Aims**, 8 618
Ogg, F. A. (Wisconsin), Research in

- Humanistic and Social Sciences (BR)**, 5 313
Officers—, Election of—, 2 93;
Committee to Nominate—, 5 302;
Nominations for 1929—, 7 493
Oregon, Lower Division Work, 7 557
Organization and Publicity, A. H. Thorndike, 5 343
Osborn, H. F. (Columbia), Creative Education in School, College, University, and Museum (BR), 2 130

P

- Paget, E. H.** (Syracuse), Logic and Persuasion, 8 582
Pan Politikon, Kentucky, 4 289
Park, J. Edgar (Wheaton), The Effect of College on the Student's Mind, 6 439
Pathfinder in the Wilderness, M. L. Spencer, 5 392
Pease, A. S. (Amherst), Aims of a Liberal College, 2 135
Peixotto, Jessica B. (California), Getting and Spending at the Professional Standard of Living (BR), 4 257
Pension and Insurance Plan, Wellesley, 3 224
Personnel Program, Student—, Minnesota, 6 467
Personnel System in College of Engineering, Purdue, 6 474
Ph.D., Occupational Destination of—, M. E. Haggerty, 7 494
Ph.D., Yale, 5 401
Ph.D.'s in Industry, Wisconsin, 8 621
Porto Rico, University of—, 5 303
Poteat, H. McN. (Wake Forest), An Educational Credo, 7 512
President, Selection of—, Johns Hopkins, 5 397
President's Address, W. T. Semple, 3 162
President's Message, The New—, Henry Crew, 3 167
Presidents, Three Plans for—, 5 367
Pressey, S. L. (Ohio State), Research Adventures in University Teaching, (BR), 4 262
Professional Codes, B. Y. Landis (BR), 2 129
Professional and Semi-professional Schools or Divisions at Graduate Level, C. E. Seashore, 8 594

Professor vs. Psychiatrist, *Donald Slesinger*, 5 367

Professors, Rating—, *Oberlin*, 4 290

Progressive Education Association, 2 133

Proportional Representation, *Oberlin*, 2 151

Psychological Tests, *Louisiana*, 8 616

R

Randall, Herman, Jr. (Columbia), Science and the Educated Man, 7 531

Randall, O. E. (Brown), Enlistment and Training of College Teachers, 4 276; 5 329

Rappleye, W. C. (Yale), Medical Education, 3 169

Reading Lists, Alumni, *Wesleyan*, 4 294

Reeves, F. W. (Kentucky), The Cost of College Education, 5 326; 7 543

Research.—Adventures in University Teaching, *S. L. Pressey* (BR), 4 262; —Club, *Dakota Wesleyan*, 6 465; —in Colleges, *M. M. Metcalf*, 4 277; Alumni—Foundation, *Wyoming*, 3 226; Grants for—, American Council of Learned Societies, 8 568; Grants in Aid of—, *California*, 8 614; —in Humanistic and Social Sciences, *F. A. Ogg* (BR), 5 313; —Institute on Rural Affairs, *Columbia*, 6 461; —and Other Intellectual Activities, *P. B. McDonald*, 7 528; Specialization and Cooperation in Scientific—, *K. T. Compton*, 3 203; —and Teaching, *Hans Zinsser*, 3 207

Rhodes Scholarship Plan, New—, 8 569

Road to Xanadu, *J. L. Lowes* (BR), 3 183

Robertson, D. A. (American Council), American Universities and Colleges, 5 318; What is Graduate Work? 8 592

Robinson, F. B. (City of New York), The Practical Scholar, 7 536

Ruediger, W. C. (George Washington), Curricular Gaps, 5 358

S

Sackett, R. L. (Pennsylvania State), The Engineer (BR), 8 576

St. Stephen's College, Merger with Columbia, 6 477

Salary Differential Fund, *North Carolina*, 5 398

Salary Scales, New—, *Oberlin*, 2 151

Scholar, The Practical—, *F. B. Robinson*, 7 536

Scholars, Does Business Want—? *W. S. Gifford*, 7 547

Scholarship "Yankee Ingenuity," *Worcester*, 7 561

Scholarships, Banker's Association, 6 421

Scholastic Aptitude Tests, *Amherst*, 8 612

School Costs, 5 383

School and Society and Educational Review, 8 570

Science.—and Educated Man, *Herman Randall, Jr.*, 7 531; General—Courses, *Buffalo*, 6 458; —and the Professions, *E. P. Lyon*, 4 276

Sciences, Teaching—, *N. M. Butler*, 3 201

Scientific Men, Origin and Distribution of—, *J. M. Cattell*, 3 199

Scientific Research, Specialization and Cooperation in—, *K. T. Compton*, 3 203

Seashore, C. E. (Iowa), Professional and Semi-professional Schools or Divisions at the Graduate Level, 8 594

Secretary's Report, *H. W. Tyler*, 2 120

Seiple, W. T. (Cincinnati), President's Address, 3 162

Service Bureau, Supervisory, *Wisconsin*, 7 560

Shorey, Paul (Chicago), Democracy and Scholarship, 3 190

Slesinger, Donald, Professor vs. Psychiatrist, 5 367

Smith, Holmes (Washington University), Art Instruction in Colleges and Universities, 4 246

Social Service and Religion, Board of—, *Chicago*, 5 396

South Dakota State College (see *Academic Freedom and Tenure*)

Spanish-American Literature in American Colleges, 5 304

Spanish and Portuguese, Summer Courses—, 5 304

Spencer, M. L. (Washington), Inaugural Address, 5 392

Standard of Living, Getting and Spending at the Professional—, *Jessica B. Peixotto* (BR), 4 257

"Standards" and the Teaching Load in Sciences, 8 597

State Universities, Freedom in—, *L. D. Coffman*, 6 441
 Stone, H. E. (West Virginia), What Does a Dean Do? 7 526
 Student League of Nations, 5 305
 Student Loans, *Brown*, 4 287; *Wesleyan*, 2 154
 Student, Methods of Handling Doubtful—, *Buffalo*, 3 221; —Self-Support, *Minnesota*, 4 290
 Student's Mind, The Effect of College on—, *J. E. Park*, 6 439
 Students and the Administration, *Lucia R. Briggs*, 5 325
 Students, Three Types of—, *H. E. Hawkes*, 7 556
 Summer Course in European Geology, *Harvard*, 6 466
 Summer Courses in Foreign Countries, 4 238
 Summer Reading, Alumnae—, *Wellesley*, 4 294; Reading List, *Wesleyan*, 294
 Summer School for Women Workers, *Barnard*, 6 457
 Summer Schools, An Adverse Idea, *R. L. Henry*, 3 217

T

Teaching Load, "Standards" and the—in Sciences, 8 597
 Teacher Training, Small Colleges and—, *J. G. Meyer*, 8 578
 Teachers, Training College—, *C. C. Little*, 8 603
 Teaching.—Defects in College—, *C. C. Crawford*, 8 599; —and the Ph.D., *M. E. Haggerty*, 8 584; Improvement of—, *Oregon*, 4 291; Preparing the College Graduate for High School—, *F. T. Beck*, 7 511; —Teachers, *W. M. Lewis*, 2 141
 Thorndike, A. H. (Columbia), Organization and Publicity, 5 343
 Thwing, C. F., The American and the German University, 5 321, 387
 Treasurer's Report, *Joseph Mayer*, 2 122
 Trustees, Reorganization of Board of—, *Pennsylvania*, 2 153
 Tutorial Experiment, *Mass. Inst. Tech.*, 6 467
 Tutorial House, *Radcliffe*, 8 621

U

Uhrbrock, R. S. (Wyoming), Corporation Schools, 3 213

Undergraduate Program, A New—, *Columbia*, 6 462
 U. S. Bureau of Education, 6 414
 Universities and Their Function, *A. N. Whitehead*, 6 448
 University College, *Michigan*, 2 149; 6 467
 University Exchanges, Handbooks of—, in Europe, 8 569
 University, Function of the—, *G. J. Laing*, 5 348

V

Vacation Cum Laude, 5 394

W

Walden, P. T. (Yale), Importance of Freshman Year, 4 284
 Wenley, R. M. (Michigan), British Degrees for Americans, 4 251
 West Chester Normal School, Statement— (see *Academic Freedom and Tenure*)
 What Price Honor, *G. H. Moore*, 5 391
 Whitehead, A. N. (Harvard), Universities and their Function, 6 448
 Who's Who in Education (BR), 6 423
 Wilbur, R. L. (Stanford), Junior College in California, 5 362
 Wilkins, E. H. (Oberlin), The Changing College, 4 259
 Withington, Robert (Smith), College Debating, 7 550
 Women and the Ph.D., *Emilie J. Hutchinson*, 8 587
 Women Workers, Summer School for—, *Barnard*, 6 457
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Dismissal of Full Professor, 4 294
 Works, F. A. (Chicago), College and University Library Problems (BR), 3 181
 World Citizenship, Education for—, *W. G. Carr*, 8 579
 World Federation of Education Association, 2 133

Z

Zinsser, Hans (Harvard), Research and Teaching, 3 207

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1928

PRESIDENT	
HENRY CREW ¹ (<i>Physics</i>)	Northwestern University
VICE-PRESIDENT	
MARIAN P. WHITNEY (<i>German</i>)	Vassar College
SECRETARY	
H. W. TYLER ¹ (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Mass. Institute of Technology
TREASURER	
JOSEPH MAYER ¹ (<i>Economics</i>)	Tufts College

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

For the term ending January 1, 1929

E. D. ADAMS (<i>History</i>)	Stanford University
F. T. BLANCHARD (<i>English</i>)	University of California (Los Angeles)
B. P. BOURLAND (<i>Romance Languages</i>)	Western Reserve University
S. E. BRASEFIELD (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Rutgers College
HARDIN CRAIG (<i>English</i>)	University of Iowa
G. C. EVANS (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Rice Institute
A. C. LANE (<i>Geology</i>)	Tufts College
GEORGE REBBE (<i>Philosophy</i>)	University of Oregon
EUNICE M. SCHENCK (<i>French</i>)	Bryn Mawr College
C. F. SCOTT (<i>Electrical Engineering</i>)	Yale University

For term ending January 1, 1930

ERNEST BERNBAUM (<i>English</i>)	University of Illinois
R. M. BIRD (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Virginia
KATHERINE GALLAGHER (<i>History</i>)	Goucher College
E. E. HALE ¹ (<i>English</i>)	Union College
E. R. HEDRICK (<i>Mathematics</i>)	University of California (Los Angeles)
ERNEST MERRITT (<i>Physics</i>)	Cornell University
H. J. MULLER (<i>Zoology</i>)	University of Texas
G. W. STEWART (<i>Physics</i>)	University of Iowa
R. H. TRUE (<i>Botany</i>)	University of Pennsylvania
KARL YOUNG (<i>English</i>)	Yale University

For term ending January 1, 1931

E. G. CONKLIN ¹ (<i>Biology</i>)	Princeton University
W. W. COOK ¹ (<i>Law</i>)	Johns Hopkins University
R. E. DENGLE (<i>Greek</i>)	Pennsylvania State College
W. L. EVANS (<i>Chemistry</i>)	Ohio State University
J. P. GOODE (<i>Geography</i>)	University of Chicago
W. K. HATT (<i>Civil Engineering</i>)	Purdue University
A. C. IVY (<i>Medicine</i>)	Northwestern University
ELIZABETH R. LAIRD (<i>Physics</i>)	Mt. Holyoke College
C. E. MAGNUSSON (<i>Electrical Engineering</i>)	University of Washington
W. M. PERSONS (<i>Economics</i>)	Harvard University

Ex-officio (until year noted)

J. V. DENNEY (<i>English</i>) (1928)	Ohio State University
A. O. LEUSCHNER (<i>Astronomy</i>) (1930)	University of California
W. T. SIMPLIN ¹ (<i>Classics</i>) (1932)	University of Cincinnati

¹ Members of the Executive Committee

This BULLETIN, issued monthly except in June, July, August, and September, contains information in regard to the current work and plans of the American Association of University Professors.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION

(A list of publications prior to 1926 will be sent on application.)

January, 1926, Vol. XII, No. 1. Constitution and List of Members.

February-March, 1926, Vol. XII, Nos. 2-3. Annual Meeting; Student Assistants; Encouragement of Research; Sectioning on the Basis of Ability.

April, 1926, Vol. XII, No. 4. Intercollegiate Football; Committees for 1926.

May, 1926, Vol. XII, No. 5. Educational Discussion.

October, 1926, Vol. XII, No. 6. The Selection, Retention, and Promotion of Undergraduates.

November, 1926, Vol. XII, No. 7. Reports of Societies; Educational Discussion.

December, 1926, Vol. XII, No. 8. Reports of Societies; Educational Discussion.

January, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 1. Constitution and List of Members.

February, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 2. Annual Meeting; Educational Discussion.

March, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 3. Degree of Doctor of Philosophy; Presidential Reports.

April, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 4. Educational Discussion; List of Committees.

May, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 5. Committee A, Academic Freedom and Tenure; Societies and Foundations.

October, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 6. Report on the University of Louisville.

November, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 7. Annual Meeting; Educational Discussion.

December, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 8. Local Chapter Problems; Laws against Teaching Evolution.

January, 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 1. Constitution; List of Members; Committees.

February, 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 2. Annual Meeting; Committee Reports; Reports of Officers.

March, 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 3. Presidential Addresses; Foreign Language Study and Requirements.

April, 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 4. Art Instruction in Colleges and Universities; British Degrees for Americans.

May, 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 5. Reviews; Association of American Colleges.

October, 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 6. Annual Meeting; Reviews.

November, 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 7. Annual Meeting; Educational Discussion.

Single copies of any of the above, except as noted, thirty-five cents. Subscription price, two dollars and fifty cents per volume.

H. W. TYLER, Secretary, 222 Charles River Road, Cambridge, Mass.